Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-025
Monday
8 February 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-025 *8 February 1988*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Underground Nuclear Explosion at Semipalatinsk 1
Nuclear, Space Arms Negotiations Continue 1
Petrovskiy Sees 'Difficulties' 1
Yazov Writes on Balance of Forces, Parity *[PRAVDA 8 Feb]* 1
Karpov Sees INF Treaty of 'Unique Significance' 6
Soltan: U.S. Working on 'Regional SDI Variant' 6
U.S. 'To Continue' Bacteriological Warfare *[Knyazkov]* 7
U.S. Chemical Weapons Position 'of Concern' 7
TV Shows Missiles Ready for Elimination 8
NATO, Warsaw Pact Consult in Vienna 8
U.S. Sets Up New INF Inspection Agency 9

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

'Friendship-88' Exercise Ends in Hungary 10
Hungary's Marjai Describes CEMA Decisions 10
Antonov, Pejovski on SFRY's CEMA Commitment 10
CEMA Labor Officials Confer in Moscow *[PRAVDA 29 Jan]* 10

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Progress in Solving Regional Conflicts Viewed *[Shishlin]* 11
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' *[Bogdanov, Shishlin, Levin]* 11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Shultz in Seattle Comments on Relations 17
'Stereotypes' in Speech Hit *[PRAVDA 7 Feb]* 17
West's 'Dynamism' Questioned 18
Shultz, Crowe Remarks on INF Treaty Cited 18
Senators Send Letter to Shultz on INF Treaty 18
U.S. Adversaries Try 'To Torpedo' INF Accord 19
U.S. Forms Nuclear Arms On-Site Inspection Group 19
Carlucci Comments on NATO at FRG Conference 19
Utah 'Bigeye' Bacteriological Weapon Lab Planned *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Feb]* 20
Project 'Irresponsible' *[IZVESTIYA 5 Feb]* 20
'Serious Defects' Noted in 'Trident-1' System 21
Launch of 'Delta' Rocket Postponed 21
'Terrorist' Appointed to UN Rights Commission *[IZVESTIYA 6 Feb]* 21

China

Soviet, PRC Officials Meet on Latin America 22
CPC Politburo Discusses Economic Reform *[PRAVDA 8 Feb]* 22
Zhao Stresses Importance of Trade Relations *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Jan]* 23

Northeast Asia

Northern Territories Called Anti-Soviet 23
Takeshita Attends Activities 24
Takeshita on Right To Discuss U.S. Nuclear Arms 24

Southeast Asia & Pacific

More on Indonesian Foreign Minister's Visit 24
Received by Gorbachev 24
Speaks with Shevardnadze 25
Shevardnadze Speaks at Mokhtar Dinner *[PRAVDA 6 Feb]* 26

Near East & South Asia

Najibullah on Soviet Troop Withdrawal Statement 27
Afghan Army 'Successful' in Herat, Qandahar 28
Arms Convoy Seized at Afghan-Pakistani Border 28

East Europe

PZPR Politburo Discusses Price Reforms *[PRAVDA 5 Feb]* 28
Public Reaction to Increases 28
First Ombudsman Examines 'Injustices' in Poland *[TRUD 29 Jan]* 29
Ceausescu Discusses 1987 Plan Fulfillment *[PRAVDA 7 Feb]* 29
Ceausescu Thanks CPSU, Presidium for Greetings *[PRAVDA 7 Feb]* 30
Nikonov, Medvedev Attend Romanian Jubilee *[IZVESTIYA 5 Feb]* 30
Dobrynin Receives Bulgaria's Lukanov 30
LCY Weekly Analyzes Kosovo's 'Backwardness' *[PRAVDA 29 Jan]* 31

West Europe

FRG'S Spaeth Pays Official Visit to Soviet Union 31
Interviewed Before Visit *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Feb]* 31
Arrives in Moscow *[DPA]* 32
Vorotnikov 'Taken Ill' *[DPA]* 32
Holds Talks With Tabeyev 32

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev Delivers Statement on Afghanistan 34
Maslyukov Named Gosplan Chief, Talyzin Relieved 36
Maslyukov Biography 36
Politburo Commission Repeals Bukharin Conviction 36
Gerasimov Reads Report 37
IZVESTIYA Interviews Court Member *[Bodnaruk, 7 Feb]* 37
'Victims' of Repression 40
Press Eliminating 'Blank Spots' in History 40
Uzbek CP Leaders Lambasted at CC Plenum *[Artemenko in PRAVDA 5 Feb]* 40
Gromyko Speaks to Lithuanian Aktiv 42
Vilnius Report 43
Visits Housing Developments 44
Leaves Vilnius for Moscow 44
Zaykov Examines Problems at 'Dinamo' Association *[PRAVDA 4 Feb]* 44
Zaykov, Yazov at Radio Ministry Meeting 45
Nikonov, Other Leaders Attend Workers Meeting 45
Broader View of Lenin's Testament Advocated *[Kim in PRAVDA 5 Feb]* 45
Execution, Rehabilitation of Commander Recalled
[Karpenko in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Jan] 48

Procurator General Cites Drop in Crime 50
'Union' Seen as Counterpoint to Ministries 51
Lithuanian CP Plenum Hears Restructuring Report 51
Vatican Supports Lithuanian 'Extremists' 52
'Extremist Elements' Disrupt Estonian Meeting 52
More on Yaroslavl Toxic Spill Accident 53
Workers Hospitalized *[Solenikov in TRUD 4 Feb]* 53
Commission Completes Work 53
Former Leader G.I. Petrovskiy Commemorated *[IZVESTIYA 5 Feb]* 54
OVIR Official on Visa Regulations, Emigration 54
Psychiatrist Refuses to Talk to Paper *[Leskov in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Feb]* 54
Tatars Protest Halt to Crimean Resettlement *[AFP]* 55
Dissident Publishing Using 'High-Tech' Equipment *[AFP]* 55
Pozner Comments on New Legislative Amendment 56
Snow Triggers Avalanches in Kirghizia 56

Economic

Council of Ministers Reviews Economic Progress 56
Currency Stores Called 'Hotbed of Machinations' 57

Agricultural

Media Report 1-6 Feb Agricultural Developments 57

Underground Nuclear Explosion at Semipalatinsk
LD060507 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0458 GMT 6 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow: 6 Feb (TASS)—An underground nuclear explosion with a yield of up to 20 kilotons was carried out at the testing ground in the area of Semipalatinsk in the Soviet Union at 0720 Moscow time today.

The test was carried out in the aim of checking the results of research in the field of nuclear explosion physics.

Nuclear, Space Arms Negotiations Continue
LD051840 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] Geneva February 5 TASS—Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space armaments continued within the framework of groups on strategic offensive armaments and outer space in the past week.

The leaders of the delegations had a meeting today. They considered in detail the state of affairs at the negotiations and designated questions which call for priority attention from the viewpoint of compliance with the instructions to the delegations, agreed upon as a result of the Soviet-American summit negotiations in Washington in December 1987.

Petrovskiy Sees 'Difficulties'
LD062025 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 6 Feb 88

[Text] A deputy Soviet Foreign minister said difficulties have appeared of late at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva. Vladimir Petrovskiy was speaking on Soviet national television on Saturday. The United States, he said, tended to depart from the understandings reached in Reykjavik and Washington. Petrovskiy said he was looking forward to the beginning on 21st February of a 3-day meeting between Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. A great deal, he said, will depend on what Mr Shultz will put on the negotiating table. Then it will become clear whether the United States is ready to get action on the agreement reached in Washington for cutting by half strategic offensive arms, (?but) simultaneously abiding by the ABM Treaty in the form it was signed in 1972.

Yazov Writes on Balance of Forces, Parity
PM080905 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Feb 88 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Army General D.T. Yazov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and USSR defense minister: "On the Military Balance of Forces and Nuclear Missile Parity"; boldface as published]

[Text] One of the main results of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington was the signing of the USSR-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. This treaty, so the 17 December 1987 CPSU Central Committee Politburo session observed, is historic insofar as it is the first to register a decision by the sides to actually destroy two classes of USSR and U.S. nuclear armaments. The very strict verification measures provided for by the treaty reliably ensure the monitoring [proverka] of its fulfillment.

A major outcome of the Washington talks was the significant progress made along the path of understanding the need for a radical reduction of both sides' strategic offensive armaments while observing the ABM Treaty in the form [vid] in which the USSR and the United States signed it in 1972. The conclusion of an appropriate agreement on this main problem would mark a big shift in the disarmament cause and the future creation of a nuclear-free world. Progress was achieved in several other areas: banning and eliminating chemical weapons, and halting nuclear tests.

World opinion places a high value on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit. It made a start on the task of ridding mankind of the terrible burden of the arms race and the threat of war, which hold back and often even reverse the economic development of peoples and states and fetter the peoples' freedom, culture, and spiritual and social creativity.

But not everyone assessed this event positively. It can only be cause for concern that enemies of detente and cooperation are standing in the way of changes for the better in the international situation and demanding that the U.S. leadership should not go too far but should stop the disarmament process. They are striving for the early adoption of measures to "compensate" for the U.S. intermediate- and short-range missiles being eliminated under the treaty and proposing a variety of projects for upgrading NATO armaments, by moving up more U.S. nuclear forces into Europe or closer to Europe and accelerating the expansion of West European countries' nuclear and conventional armaments. All this is being done on the pretext that the Warsaw Pact countries supposedly have "overwhelming" military superiority over the NATO bloc in terms of conventional armaments and that the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles allegedly upsets the strategic balance in the USSR's favor. Therefore, they say, steps must be taken to eliminate the West's "military lag." The device is an old one, as are the purposes behind it: The propaganda campaign being waged by the West pursues the aim of extracting more concessions from the Soviet side.

The reality is that the military equilibrium has not been upset, either in the world as a whole or in Europe. We in the Soviet Union are ready to look seriously into the questions of conventional armaments in Europe, considering that they have now come into prominence together

with the solution of the problem of strategic offensive armaments. The way to start, we believe, is with an assessment of the correlation between the two alliances' armed forces.

The task of objectively appraising the military balance of forces between the Warsaw Pact and the NATO bloc is entirely soluble. In seeking to solve it we need to draw together and take into account political, economic, physical-geographical, and psychological as well as purely military factors. By using this method of comparing all the factors, military-political figures and scientific research organisations in a number of leading states (for example, several former U.S. defense secretaries, and the London Institute of Strategic Research) have come to the unanimous conclusion that at the present time it is possible to talk about the existence of approximate equality between the USSR and U.S. strategic forces and of military equilibrium between the Warsaw Pact and the NATO bloc.

USSR-U.S. strategic equilibrium took shape in the first half of the seventies when the Soviet Union, concerned to reinforce its security, created a nuclear potential comparable with the U.S. potential. The existence of USSR-U.S. strategic equilibrium has been repeatedly verified and confirmed in the process of drawing up the SALT-II treaty and in the course of subsequent Soviet-U.S. talks. The U.S. Administration has no grounds for asserting that the USSR has ever violated the principle of equality and identical security. This has never been so and it is not so now. The existence of strategic parity is confirmed by the quantitative indicators for USSR and U.S. strategic nuclear forces given in the table below.

Figures for the numbers of USSR and U.S. strategic offensive armaments (as of 1 January 1988) [subhead]

	USSR	United States
ICBM launchers	1,390	1,000
including: ICBM launchers equipped with MIRV'd missiles	812	550
SLBM launchers	942	672
including: SLBM launchers equipped with MIRV'd missiles	388	640
Total number of ICBM and SLBM launchers	2,332	1,672
including: ICBM and SLBM launchers equipped with MIRV'D missiles	1,200	1,190
Heavy bombers	162	588
including: heavy bombers equipped to carry cruise missiles	72	161
Total of ICBM and SLBM launchers and heavy bombers	2,494	2,260
including: ICBM and SLBM launchers and heavy bombers equipped with MIRV'D missiles or for cruise missiles	1,272	1,351
Total charges [zaryad] on strategic carriers	approx 10,000	14,000-16,000

The table shows the USSR possesses a few more delivery vehicles (the USSR 2,494, the United States 2,260), while the United States still carries considerably more charges on them, and yet it is the charges and not the actual delivery vehicles that possess the destructive capability. On the whole, then, there exists an approximate balance.

The truth would seem obvious and should be recognized. Yet in the propaganda used when assessing the sides' strategic forces some representatives of the U.S. Administration ignore some figures, overemphasize others, or just resort to plain distortion. It is said, for example, that the Soviet Union has around 70 percent of its nuclear charges on ground-based ICBM's, while the United States has around 20 percent. But nothing is said here about the fact that this does not upset the overall balance of strategic potentials, since the United States has more than 80 percent of its nuclear charges on SLBM's and heavy bombers, that is to say, several times more than on the corresponding components of the Soviet strategic forces.

Arguments about the particularly destabilizing role played by Soviet heavy ICBM's figure pretty often in Washington's arsenal of evidence. But they are completely unfounded. Around 20 years ago, when the United States had considerable superiority over the USSR, it did not describe such missiles as destabilizing arms. But when the Soviet Union acquired the capability to make an adequate response to a strike against its own territory by a strike against U.S. territory, then Soviet heavy ICBM's became the "chief source of instability."

All this propaganda evidence is designed to justify U.S. military programs and is an attempt to smash the strategic parity and gain a position of military superiority. However, the U.S. line of undermining the strategic balance is futile. The military-economic and military-technical potential of the sides is now such that no efforts on the part of one side in pursuit of superiority in the military sphere can be successful—the other side will not allow it. This precise tenet was enshrined in the joint statement in which the USSR and U.S. leaders committed themselves not to seek to achieve military superiority. The arms race cannot be won under modern conditions. "Both sides," M.S. Gorbachev stresses, "should get used to strategic parity as the natural state of Soviet-U.S. relations. Given this, there should be discussion

about how by mutual efforts the level of this parity can be lowered. In other words, how to implement real measures to reduce nuclear arms on a mutual basis."

The meeting in Washington brought the USSR and U.S. leaders closer to solving the central problem of Soviet-U.S. relations—the problem of radically reducing the sides' strategic offensive arms while observing the ABM Treaty. The outlines of an agreement envisaging a 50-percent cut in strategic offensive arms have actually been drawn.

What scale of agreement on cutting strategic offensive arms are we actually talking about here? As is well-known, an accord on reducing USSR and U.S. strategic offensive arms to a maximum of 1,600 units for delivery systems (strategic delivery vehicles) and 6,000 combat charges was reached back at Reykjavik, and the rules for **counting** heavy bombers and certain other questions were agreed. The Washington meeting added quite a lot that was new to these accords.

First, the sides agreed to set ceiling levels of 4,900 units on the total number of ICBM's and SLBM's within the framework of the aggregate level of 6,000 warheads. At the same time sublevels were agreed for heavy missiles (1,540 warheads on 154 heavy missiles). This fairly substantial progress was possible because the Soviet side went along with the U.S. wishes.

Second, in the course of the Washington meeting it was possible to reach agreement on the question of the need to elaborate an accord which would oblige both the Soviet and the U.S. side to comply with the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972, including in the process of implementation of research, developments, and, where necessary, tests which are permitted under the ABM Treaty. Not to withdraw from that treaty for an agreed period. This is enshrined in the joint statement. It is also stipulated that if the USSR and the United States do not reach agreement on conditions for the nondeployment of a national ABM defense by the expiry of the agreed term of nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty, then each side will have the right to decide for itself in future its course of action both regarding the ABM Treaty and, naturally, also with regard to the Strategic Offensive Arms Treaty.

Third, at the Washington meeting the problem of limitation of the deployment of nuclear-equipped long-range sea-launched cruise missiles was studied. The sides agreed to set ceiling levels for such missiles in excess of 6,000 warheads and to seek mutually acceptable and effective methods of verification of the implementation of such limits. This is a step by the U.S. side toward the USSR's position. Prior to the Washington meeting the United States had not agreed to set any restrictions at all on SLCM's, which was making it difficult to elaborate an accord.

Thus on the basis of the existing parity and as a result of persistent and purposeful efforts by the Soviet delegation it proved possible in Washington to achieve significant progress on the problem of the radical reduction of strategic offensive arms. The USSR proceeds on the basis that it is realistic to set the task of preparing a corresponding treaty and all the associated documents for signing in Moscow during the U.S. President's return visit to the USSR in the first half of 1988.

Some people are now trying to misrepresent the sense of the joint Soviet-U.S. statement. SDI supporters in the United States make out that the elaboration of a Strategic Offensive Arms Treaty could take place without any link to the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972, and that given compliance with the ABM Treaty for an agreed term, there supposedly exists freedom of action regarding tests of components of an ABM system in space. All these are dangerous arguments aimed at undermining the constructive dialogue which has taken shape in the sphere of resolving the strategic offensive arms problem. The most important thing now, in our opinion, is not to lose the momentum gained, but to act consistently and cosntructively, advancing step by step along the path of the quest for mutually acceptable solutions based on the existing strategic parity and the impetus provided by the meeting of the Soviet and U.S. leaders in Washington.

Once we had agreed on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and seemingly made a constructive start on the resolution of the problem of the radical reduction of strategic arms, **the importance of questions of reducing armed forces and tactical nuclear and conventional arms in Europe emerged more clearly**.

Why are talks needed on these questions? The military confrontation in Europe is too great, and therefore dangerous. Enormous groupings of the Armed Forces of the NATO bloc and the Warsaw Pact oppose each other here. The buildup of the nonnuclear potential continues. The development of conventional arms is reaching fundamentally new levels—their yield, accuracy, rapidity of use, and range are growing. The destructive consequences of a war using conventional means have become virtually comparable to the consequences of a nuclear war. A war using conventional means is less and less susceptible to any restrictions either in terms of the gravity of the consequences or in terms of the scale of losses. It is becoming increasingly clear, albeit gradually, that in such a war too it is hard to achieve victory. A war using only conventional means, if unleashed, could prove fatal to Europe, in view of the high population density and the existence on Europe's territory of a large number of nuclear power stations, chemical enterprises, major hydroelectric power stations, and other sites which constitute a great danger to human life in the event of their destruction. In this context the significance and urgency of European talks is obvious.

The state of the Armed Forces and armaments of the NATO bloc and the Warsaw Pact Organization offers the opportunity, while observing the principle of equality and identical security, on a reciprocal basis considerably to lower the level of military confrontation in Europe. How can this be done?

In accordance with the Budapest Appeal by the leaders of the Warsaw Pact states, the countries of our defensive alliance advocate implementing an initial single mutual reduction over 1-2 years in the numerical strength of NATO and Warsaw Pact troops by 100,000-150,000 men on each side; in the **early** nineties reducing the ground forces and tactical assault aircraft of the two military alliances in Europe by one-fourth (a total of more than 1 million men on both sides); **subsequently** continuing the reduction of Armed Forces and conventional arms of all the European states, the United States, and Canada.

They talk a great deal in the West about the Warsaw Pact countries' so-called "overwhelming superiority" in conventional arms—because of which, apparently, we must agree to unilateral cuts. Such statements do not correspond to reality. NATO specialists strive to emphasize the Warsaw Pact's superiority in certain elements of conventional arms—for example, in numbers of tanks. But they refuse to compare the quantity and quality of the sides' arms as a whole and compare their military doctrines. They will not agree to a thorough, bilateral analysis of the real potential of the sides' armed forces and an examination, by means of comparison, of the military potentials in comprehensive terms as opposed to individual types of arms.

At the same time, it is well-known that only the comprehensive approach can provide an objective picture, since the Warsaw Pact and NATO bloc Armed Forces are very diverse and heterogeneous and their structure and organization are different. The NATO countries have superiority in some areas, the Warsaw Pact in others. But the individual disproportions which objectively exist on both sides do not undermine the overall military balance.

Take, for example, the sides' navies. In this component of the armed forces the NATO bloc has considerable superiority over the Warsaw Pact: in terms of large surface ships (battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and missile frigates)—almost threefold; in terms of naval aircraft—2.5 times; in terms of the total tonnage of naval ships—twofold. A 28 January 1987 White House report, for example, said: "Superiority at sea enables us to exploit the Soviet Union's geographical vulnerability and pose a global threat to Soviet interests."

The NATO countries have a quantitative and qualitative superiority in combat aircraft that cannot be concealed. According to data cited in the Pentagon booklet "Soviet Military Power" (1986, p 89), this superiority constitutes 1,150 aircraft, not counting the French and Spanish Air Forces. According to our estimate, NATO has 1,400 more strike aircraft in Europe.

One wonders why the United States and NATO do not raise the question of eliminating the naval and air force "imbalance." Is it not a threat to us? Disarmament talks have been going on for 20 years now, and all that time the United States and the NATO bloc as a whole have refused to consider the problem of cutting and limiting navies and air forces. What is the reason? Why is the emphasis only on ground forces? Any military expert knows that when analyzing the correlation of forces you cannot separate armed forces. The point is, however, that this NATO line is geared to weakening the USSR and preserving for the United States and NATO their strongest components (Navy and Air Force).

This is obvious from the NATO countries' stance at the Vienna meeting of CSCE states, where the NATO bloc representatives focused efforts on trying to prove the unprovable—that the Warsaw Pact has large superiority in conventional armaments on land and is threatening Western Europe. Therefore, they say, it is necessary to secure from it a unilateral cut in ground forces in isolation from their nuclear component and tactical strike aircraft. This is an incorrect, dishonest presentation of the question. Such U.S. and NATO actions are geared to achieving military superiority over the Warsaw Pact, and they are an obstacle to the elaboration of a mandate for European talks at the Vienna meeting.

Statements by representatives of the NATO bloc about the Warsaw Pact's so-called superiority in conventional arms on land are groundless and do not stand up to criticism. Can one talk of "superiority" when the NATO calculations do not take into account French and Spanish Armed Forces (1 million men, 20 divisions)? On what grounds does the balance of forces fail to take into account that part of the armed forces under NATO countries' national control and the stocks of arms and equipment in dumps? Why are the data on NATO Armed Forces deliberately understated, whereas those on Warsaw Pact Armed Forces are overstated (taking into account military construction personnel, border forces, police, and the USSR DOSAAF)? The result is a distorted picture of the correlation of forces, and this lie is presented as proof of Warsaw Pact superiority in conventional armed forces and armaments.

In this connection it is interesting to read an article published in the British GUARDIAN newspaper on 27 November 1987 and headed "Warsaw Pact Military Superiority Exaggerated." It gives an account of a report by the Western European Union Military Committee which repudiates claims by NATO countries' governments that the Warsaw Pact possesses an overwhelming superiority in nonnuclear forces. "The report is an impartial account," THE GUARDIAN writes, "of how NATO has doctored the statistics about the correlation of armed forces with the Warsaw Pact. Its conclusion is

that "the committee cannot help observing how for years official statements by the allies concerning the levels of certain weapon systems belonging to the Soviet Union have suffered from inconsistencies and, in a number of cases, the assessments contained in them have differed so much as to arouse suspicion. It was not without reason, evidently, that the Western European Union Military Committee report on the correlation of Warsaw Pact and NATO bloc military forces, when it appeared in the press, scared a number of Western figures." [end quotes as published]

What is the real picture regarding the correlation of forces? The NATO and Warsaw Pact Armed Forces are approximately equal in number. Armies numbering 3 million are at present confronting each other in Europe.

The number of the NATO bloc's combat-ready formations (divisions and brigades) is almost 50 percent greater than that of the Warsaw Pact. Furthermore, a U.S. division numbers 16,000-19,000 men and an FRG division numbers around 24,000 men, whereas a Warsaw Pact Army division numbers at most 11,000-12,000 men.

The Warsaw Pact has approximately 20,000 more tanks in Europe. NATO, however, has almost 50 percent more helicopter gunships, including some equipped with antitank facilities, and approximately twice as many antitank missile complexes.

They tell us that the Warsaw Pact countries have superiority in Central Europe. If that is so, it can only be so if you disregard the French forces. However, NATO has superiority on the southern flank of Europe: The ratios are 2.6 to 1 in personnel and strike aircraft, 5.8 to 1 in helicopter gunships, and 1.9 to 1 in artillery.

If we take the problem of the correlation of forces in Europe as a whole, the picture is as follows: NATO and the Warsaw Pact have approximately equal numbers of personnel and artillery. The Warsaw Pact exceeds NATO in tanks. NATO has superiority in terms of combat-ready formations and fighter-bombers. In conventional arms as a whole we have approximate equilibrium, approximate parity. According to figures from the London Institute of Strategic Studies, "the overall balance of forces in conventional armaments is such that... neither side has sufficient total might to guarantee victory."

Regarding the imbalances and the asymmetry in conventional armaments which have resulted from the specific historical features of the building of the sides' armed forces, it is reasonable to ask: What is preventing this problem from being resolved? The USSR is ready to examine ways of eliminating the aforementioned imbalances at the level of military alliances, but in such a way as to avoid upsetting the overall correlation of forces, which is now characterized by approximate equilibrium.

The Soviet concept on this score was set out by M.S.Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, in the following terms: "We must put our cards on the table, exchange all the data, evaluate it, reveal the asymmetry in armaments and forces, and begin resolving the problems. That is our approach.

"For our part I shall say bluntly that we are ready to get down to this work without delay, we shall insist on it. That is also our allies' opinion. In this instance I am expressing our common viewpoint.

"I shall go further: We are ready for the most fundamental reductions. Here, too, we are trying to be realists. Clearly this is a process which will proceed in stages. Everything cannot be resolved at once. But to begin you have to sit down at the negotiating table and work to eliminate the asymmetry and the imbalance and radically reduce the confrontation. This would be a considerable achievement. It can be done in the near future." [Footnote] (PRAVDA 12 Dec 1987).

Consequently it is necessary to deal in an attentive and businesslike way with the sides' concerns on questions of conventional armaments. Future European talks on this problem have every chance of success if they are concerned with a mutual and simultaneous reduction and a mutual elimination of the asymmetry and imbalances.

The success of new talks would be promoted by confidence-building measures, in particular the solution of a very important problem worrying the European peoples such as the reduction in the danger of a surprise attack. The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries offer specific measures to that end: to reduce the concentration of armed forces and armaments in the zone of direct contact between the two military alliances to a minimum agreed level; to remove dangerous offensive armaments from that zone; to create a 300 km wide nuclear-free corridor along the line of contact between the Warsaw Pact and NATO (150km on either side), from which all nuclear weapons are to be removed on a reciprocal basis; to create in Europe zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons and zones with a reduced concentration of armaments and a heightened level of trust; and to compare military doctrines and discuss "imabalances" at the level of experts. We are waiting for the United States and the NATO countries to respond and to set out for us their position on these proposals of ours.

Guided by its defensive doctrine, the USSR is building its armed forces on the basis of the principle of sufficiency for defence. As for strategic nuclear forces, sufficiency today is determined by the ability to prevent a nuclear strike from being launched with impunity against our country in any situation, even the most unfavorable. As for conventional armaments, sufficiency means the **minimum** necessary number and high quality of armed forces and armaments capable of reliably ensuring the country's defense. The limits of defensive sufficiency are determined by the actions of the United

States and NATO too. Of course the Soviet Union does not seek military superiority and does not lay claim to greater security, but it will not accept reduced security either or permit anyone to gain superiority over it. We do not intend competing with the West in creating specific kinds of weapons, and we employ those measures which safeguard the security of the Soviet state and its allies.

Proceeding from the principle of sufficiency, the USSR is making efforts to resolutely reduce the level of confrontation and reduce the military potentials so that West and East have only those forces and means necessary for defense. But this must apply to everyone.

The Soviet Armed Forces are approaching their 70th anniversary. They are fulfilling their historic mission in defense of socialist gains and the cause of peace side by side with the armies of the other allied states. The Warsaw Pact as a defensive combat alliance of fraternal socialist countries reliably serves the interests of peace and socialism. Soviet servicemen see their internationalist duty in further consolidating and developing the all-around cooperation among the allied armies. They vigilantly protect Soviet people's creative labor. Our army and navy have always been and remain a powerful factor for peace and the security of the peoples.

Karpov Sees INF Treaty of 'Unique Significance'
LD081544 Moscow TASS in English 1528 GMT 8 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 8 TASS—The chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Arms Control and Disarmament Directorate, Viktor Karpov, today described the INF Treaty as unique.

"For the first time ever, it provides for eliminating nuclear missiles, something not envisaged by any other agreement before," he told Soviet newsmen at a briefing which dealt with the first joint session of the Foreign Relations Commissions of the two chambers of the Soviet Parliament, which opens tomorrow to discuss the INF Treaty.

"The ratification of the Soviet-American treaty calls for a careful and all-round discussion from the standpoint of both the Soviet Union's security and the impact on its economy and the positive processes in international politics.

"The fact that the treaty has been submitted for consideration by the two chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet has been prompted by the need to take into account all opinions that could be set forth by Soviet people on the issue."

"They say that the Treaty for the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range missiles is insignificant since it covers just four percent of the nuclear systems of the United States and the USSR," Karpov said.

"But it has simply unique significance for Europe since practically all nuclear weapons of this class will be eliminated there. The destruction of such missiles, for example, for Belgium and Holland will be the destruction of not four percent, but all the nuclear weapons in their territories."

"The Soviet-American treaty meets the security interests of both sides," the spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said. "These interests will be met by also another agreement now being prepared—the one on 50 percent cuts in strategic offensive arms, if it is signed.

"The principle of an equal approach to the security interests of both sides has proved incarnated in the INF Treaty. It will now provide the point of departure for further solutions in the field of strategic nuclear arms," Karpov said.

Soltan: U.S. Working on 'Regional SDI Variant'
LD051743 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] On 5 February, the U.S. Senate committees end their second week of discussion of the treaty on the elimination of more than 2,600 Soviet and U.S. nuclear missiles. Yuriy Soltan elaborates:

I personally feel optimistic about the progress of the discussion. I am inclined to agree with Senator Alan Cranston that during the voting in the Senate the treaty will get even more than the 67 votes required for its ratification. I am certain that this historic treaty will win support in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, where discussion on it begins next week.

But there is one factor that arouses alarm and protest. I'd call it the compensation syndrome. The demand was often heard in Senate committees for the need to escalate the build-up of other weapons, both nuclear and conventional, to make up for the loss of medium- and shorter-range nuclear missiles. Significantly, that demand was not only made by opponents of the treaty. What sounds even more alarming is that practical steps are being made along these lines. The Pentagon has already sent a report to Congress asking for additional sums needed to develop a new nuclear tactical missile-launcher for Western Europe.

The Pentagon, besides, tries to draw U.S. allies into the work of developing nonnuclear missiles based on the latest achievements of electronic, computer, and laser technology. The United States is already engaged in negotiations over this matter with its European NATO

partners, and not with them alone. The Japanese newspaper YOMIURI has reported that Washington is trying to involve Japan in the development of very sophisticated conventional weapons that would by their destructive capacity be equal to nuclear missiles.

The plans to transfer the arms race into space are particularly dangerous. The United States is not only speeding up work on its Star Wars program, as President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative plan is known, but it is now discussing in practical terms what is called the regional SDI variant, say for Western Europe or Asia. These plans, if realized, would in my opinion depreciate the recently signed treaty on elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles. Moreover, this would put serious obstacles in the way of a new Soviet-U.S. agreement, now in the process of preparation, on a 50 percent cut in the strategic offensive weapons with the maintenance of the ABM Treaty over the mutually agreed period of time.

U.S. 'To Continue' Bacteriological Warfare

LD060952 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1925 GMT 5 Feb 88

["Forgetting the Convention"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 5 Feb (TASS)—TASS commentator Maksim Knyazkov writes:

The U.S. military has clearly conceived the idea of removing the last obstacles on the path toward the significant escalation which it is planning in preparations for a bacteriological war. According to reports from Washington, the U.S. Department of the Army has circulated a draft of its report on the possible environmental consequences of building a special laboratory for testing bacteriological aerosols at the Dugway (Utah) test site.

The absence of such research has until now slowed down a final decision on the equipping of this base. The thing is that under public pressure which demanded a complete end to the Pentagon's bacteriological program, the Washington Federal court adopted a compromise decision in 1985. The laboratory, it judged, could not be built since the military department had not studied the question of the possible consequences of this for the environment. Thus, it follows from the court's decision that when such a study has been carried out, then it would be a different matter, so to speak.

So the requisite treatise was presented for public judgment. It asserts, of course, that the possibility of leaks of morbific bacteria from the laboratory is, in practical terms, zero and for this reason the base will allegedly present "no danger whatever".

It is possible that U.S. military experts have indeed taken great care to ensure that not a single fatal aerosol seeps out of the confines of the laboratory, although it is difficult to believe. They did, after all, find that 2,352 milliliters of a substance containing the virus of the dangerous Chikunguni fever had gone missing at the U.S. bacteriological center in Fort Detrick in 1981. But this is not the issue now. The appearance of this Pentagon investigation has again eloquently demonstrated that the U.S. Administration intends to continue to step up its work on one of the most terrible forms of mass destruction weapons—bacteriological weapons.

It is well-known that an international convention prohibiting the development, production, and accumulation of stockpiles of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and their destruction has been in existence since 1972. The United States has also signed it. But all the same, for all these years facts occasionally surface which point to the fact that the actions of the U.S. authorities blatantly diverge from the demands of this international document.

For example, the CBS television network recently learned that federal allocations for preparations in the United States for bacteriological warfare increased in the period 1981-86 by more than six times—from $14 million to $90 million. Particular stress began to be laid on using the achievements of genetic engineering for military purposes. "The astonishing progress achieved over the past 5-10 years in the field of biotechnology," said Douglas Feyt, U.S. deputy assistant secretary of defense, in Congress in this connection, "means something more than simply new foods, new medicines, and new fertilizers. It means new and better biological weapons." As a result, as the WALL STREET JOURNAL shows, in 1986 the Pentagon mapped out a total of 57 projects in genetic engineering and allocated $42 billion for their implementation.

An aerosol laboratory at the Dugway proving ground, as it transpires from press reports, is needed by Washington precisely for tests of this sinister new output.

It is noteworthy that the U.S. Department of the Army began a new campaign to unblock the issue of the construction of a laboratory at the very moment when voices are being heard particularly frequently on the banks of the Potomac alleging that the Soviet Union is "violating" international treaties and that it is supposedly "not to be trusted". But what about Washington itself? Does Washington inspire confidence after its free treatment—to put it mildly—of the convention on bacteriological weapons? Isn't it high time that Americans who are anxious over the observance of treaties should deal with the situation in their own home?

U.S. Chemical Weapons Position 'of Concern'

LD062232 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 6 Feb 88

[Station Commentary by Viktor Levin]

[Text] [Announcer] At the UN Committee on Disarmament session, the representatives of many countries

advocated the speediest conclusion of a treaty prohibiting chemical weapons and the destruction of stockpilies. Here is a station commentary. At the microphone is Viktor Levin.

[Levin; live or recorded] The routine session of the committee started this week. It is possible even now to say that the overwhelming majority of states represented at it advocate the prohibition of chemical weapons. It is indicative that the foreign ministers of Czechoslovakia, Italy, and the FRG spoke about this. Comrade Chnoupek, the head of the Czechoslovak foreign policy department, in particular expressed the view that the treaty is 90 percent ready and efforts should not be spared to discuss and resolve these questions.

There are practically no differences of opinion regarding the fact that the basic work has already been done. Yet the U.S. position gives grounds for concern. It is noteworthy that criticism directed at the United States also comes from its allies and partners. This is attested to, for example, by FRG Foreign Minister Genscher's speech. According to the unanimous view of the representatives of many countries, the most recent U.S. actions, namely the manufacture of components for binary chemical weapons which began in December and President Reagan's decision to develop bombs and gasses which are intended to serve as the means of delivering these toxic substances, not only erect further obstacles in the path of elaborating a treaty but lead things in the opposite direction. And, after all, there is every reason for the rebukes; assertions about striving to prohibit chemical weapons while at the same time developing new forms of these weapons really do not tie up. After all, these facts constitute the routine diplomatic maneuvers to which U.S. representatives on the UN Committee on Disarmament resort. For example, they are doggedly seeking to impose a discussion about the dimensions of chemical weapons stockpiles.

But, in the first instance, the Soviet Union has presented data about its stocks of chemical weapons. We reported that so far as toxic substances are concerned, they do not exceed 50,000 tonnes. For some reason the Americans are doggedly seeking to convince themselves and the world that we provided understated data, although they have no grounds for such assertions.

Second, the question arises as to whether it is necessary at all to talk about who has what quantity of chemical weapons if what is in involved is the readiness—and the Soviet Union has stated this clearly—to destroy all chemical arms.

This question about stockpiles would hardly have deserved attention were it not that it concealed the desire of the United States to avoid a speedy prohibition of chemical weapons. The criticism aimed at the United States in Geneva shows that many countries understand this.

TV Shows Missiles Ready for Elimination

LD061812 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 6 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Here is a report from a nuclear missile base about the missiles soon to be eliminated. The report was prepared by the Czech television.

[Unidentified correspondent] This is a Soviet missile unit near the town of Hranice in Moravia. Missiles OTR-22 are sited here; in the United States they are known as SS-12's. Their range is up to 1,000 km. These weapons are to be eliminated in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. treaty, but the treaty has not yet been ratified and the unit is maintaining its full capability and engaged in routine combat training. Nevertheless, today is unusual. The missile men are being visited by Czechoslovak journalists: newspaper and television correspondents. They spoke to officers and soldiers and visited the school attended by their children and families. Let us be frank, only a few months ago, prior to the signing of the treaty in Washington, such reports would have hardly been possible, not just in Czechoslovakia, but also in neighboring FRG and other countries. That, of course, is a sign that there has been some warming up in the world.

[Announcer] Trust in the international arena is being strengthened but for the time being we are incapable of showing you a similar report from a U.S. base.

[Video shows missile being moved out; soldiers running on alert; two officers interviewed, with captions reading "Lieutenant Colonel Vyacheslav D. Granovskiy and Captain Viktor A. Shumakovskiy, crew commander]

NATO, Warsaw Pact Consult in Vienna

LD080950 Moscow TASS in English 0933 GMT 8 Feb 88

[Text] Vienna February 8 TASS—A regular meeting was held here today within the framework of consultations between the Warsaw Treaty member states and NATO countries on working out a mandate of the talks on the armed forces and conventional armaments from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Representatives of the USSR and other socialist countries again substantiated their proposal to the effect that the armed forces and conventional armaments, including dual-purpose systems, should be the subject of the future talks.

U.S. Sets Up New INF Inspection Agency

LD061032 Moscow TASS in English 0958 GMT 6 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 6 TASS—The U.S. Defense Department on Friday announced the formation of a new agency to verify compliance with the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Nuclear Missiles.

The Pentagon said the On-Site Inspection Agency would be responsible for conducting and overseeing inspections of nuclear weapons sites.

The Pentagon announcement said the agency should be ready to operate by April 1.

Army Brigadier General Roland Lajoie, now the U.S. military attache in Paris, has been appointed to head the new agency.

According to preliminary estimates, its staff will include 700 to 800 military and civilian personnel.

'Friendship-88' Exercise Ends in Hungary

LD061520 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1425 GMT 6 Feb 88

[Text] Budapest, 6 Feb (TASS)—The "Friendship-88" exercise ended today in Hungary. Units and sub-units of the Hungarian People's Army, the Soviet Army, and the Czechoslovak People's Army took part. The exercise was directed by Lieutenant-General L. Morocz, state secretary at the Hungarian Ministry of defense.

During the exercise, the troops were visited by G. Fejti, secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee secretary, and by Hungarian Defense Minister Colonel-General F. Karpati.

Army General A.I. Gribkov, Combined Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact member states chief of staff, was also present at the exercise.

The units and sub-units successfully carried out the tasks assigned to them and displayed a high level of combat readiness. The exercise promoted the strengthening of brotherhood-in-arms and improved the troops' field training.

Hungary's Marjai Describes CEMA Decisions

LD042236 Budapest Television Service in Hungarian 1830 GMT 4 Feb 88

[Text] The CEMA Executive Committee has concluded its 126th session. The body, which met in Moscow, discussed improvements in cooperation between member states. Jozsef Marjai, the head of the Hungarian delegation [and deputy prime minister], has given a statement to our Moscow correspondent, Mihaly Hardi.

[Begin recording] [Hardi] In what way was this last session different from the preceding 125?

[Marjai] Regarding its content, it was different in that by now the implementation of the resolutions of the 43d round is under way. The purpose of these resolutions is to modernize and further develop CEMA. Of course, there are issues of great importance on the agenda and it must be realized that the transformation is not an easy task for CEMA either, and as we are approaching the concrete steps, the debates are becoming sharper.

At any rate, three groups of issues developed during this work. One of these is the concept of dividing labor between the socialist countries until the year 2000. This is not an easy matter, of course, because on the one hand everything CEMA has achieved up to now must be preserved and, within this, we must preserve our own favorable positions, while, on the other hand, we must advance toward the resurgence, and the Hungarian program for stabilization must also provide the foundations for this.

The other big group is the system of functioning itself. So far, little has happened in this sphere; a more detailed work program has been developed. The third group of issues concerns organizational questions. In this area, concrete agreement has been reached: The organization of the CEMA secretariat will be reshaped and personnel will be reduced by about 30 percent. This is not a matter for the distant future, either; rather, it will be carried out in the next 3 months.

[Hardi] Does this mean the organization of CEMA might become more effective in the near future?

[Marjai] Well, this is not something that can be done from 1 day to the next. This is not a matter of the emergence of a new organization on Friday and a new method of work already implemented on Monday. This is a process in which we Hungarians must also participate to a marked extent. We must influence CEMA's work in the spirit of our own programs and toward their direction. [end recording]

Antonov, Pejovski on SFRY's CEMA Commitment

LD041709 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1401 GMT 4 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, 4 Feb (TANJUG)—Mito Pejovski, Federal Executive Council member, has had talks in Moscow with Aleksey Antonov, the Soviet Union's permanent representative in the CEMA and USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman, about a number of topical and practical issues concerning the participation of Yugoslav economic, scientific and technical organizations in the fulfilment of the so-called complex program of the CEMA countries' scientific-technical progress up to year 2000.

In the course of the talks, in which Budimir Lazovic, head of the SFRY's permanent mission to CEMA also took part, reference was also made to the ways of further developing cooperation between Yugoslavia and CEMA on the basis of the 1964 agreement.

CEMA Labor Officials Confer in Moscow

PM051637 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In a Businesslike Atmosphere"]

[Text] The 20th session of the conference of leaders of state labor organs in CEMA countries met in Moscow 27-28 January.

There was an exchange of opinions on further bilateral and multilateral cooperation among CEMA countries in labor and social problems.

The session was held in a friendly, businesslike atmosphere and in a spirit of full mutual understanding.

Progress in Solving Regional Conflicts Viewed
LD070210 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2300 GMT 6 Feb 88

[Political Observer Nikolay Shishlin commentary]

[Text] Talks that have been held in Moscow with representatives of several Asian states show that our country actively favors the settlement of regional conflicts. Here is a Mayak commentary. Political observer Nikolay Shishlin is at the microphone.

[Shishlin] One of the most acute problems on the agenda of world politics is that of overcoming and settling regional conflicts, and I think the position adopted and actively pursued over recent years by the Soviet Union—a position aimed at overcoming regional conflicts by political means—is truly promising. Now in 1988 we have, of course, come upon something new as regards regional conflicts. Perhaps it is not something qualitatively new. A just settlement of these regional conflicts has not been secured, but in any case, certain phenomena appear highly promising. First and foremost, I am talking about the national reconciliation policy pursued by Kabul, Managua, and Phnom Penh. This policy of national reconciliation is already producing certain quantitative results, although there still has been no qualitative change. I think there is also the new factor of understanding, not only from our country but also, let us say, from the United States as well, that regional conflicts can be settled justly only thorugh political means and by taking into consideration the right of people to choose for themselves their future path.

It is true that as far as Washington is concerned, this lesson is proving hard to assimilate. In any case, the recent saga of the White House's latest demand for funds to support the contras in Nicaragua and the ignominious defeat that was inflicted on the White House by Congress, who refused to provide these funds, shows that these lessons are proving hard to assimilate. Evidently, time will have to go by.

The third new factor, I think, is to be found in the active steps being taken to defuse these regional conflicts. Such active steps can be seen in certain new ideas of the Angolan leadership. These active steps are, of course, reflected in what is happening in Phnom Penh, in the talks and meetings that took place between Hun Sen, the prime minister of that country, and Prince Sihanouk, although Sihanouk has now stated that he is adopting the position of a private individual. They are also expressed in the very dynamic policy being pursued by the Ortega government in Nicaragua, in the interests of national reconciliation in the country.

So the new is undoubtedly knocking at the door. In this sense, energetic actions concerning even such chronic conflicts as, let us say, the Near East conflict and the Iran-Iraq war, in themselves undoubtedly make it possible to reckon that this year it will at least be possible to soften the sharpness of these conflicts. In some conflict situations, it may be possible to reach full scale settlement.

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable'
LD072052 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 7 Feb 88

["International Observers Roundtable" with Dr Radomir Bogdanov, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute; Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, political observer; and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, All-Union Radio commentator]

[Text] [Levin] Good morning, esteemed comrades. It was announced this week that from 21-23 February, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz will pay an official visit to Moscow and have talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze. This announcement shows that Soviet-U.S. relations are continuing to develop and that no pause is about to ensue in the development of those relations. This is undoubtedly a gratifying fact and a cause of satisfaction, I think, not only for the Soviet and U.S. sides but also for many other states. Everyone is very well aware that a great many things in our world depend upon the development of Soviet-U.S. relations; I think this is something on which there is no disagreement either among the Soviet or among the American participants in the talks being held at all levels. There is no disagreement that attention is focused on preparing a treaty on a 50% reduction of strategic offensive arms.

[Shishlin] To take things in their proper order, let us say something about a treaty that has already been signed: the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. At this particular moment, the process of ratification can be said to be gathering steam, both in the United States and in the Soviet Union.

[Bogdanov] It would seem, Nikolay Vladimirovich, that there is a very close dependence between the fate of this treaty, which will or will not be ratified, and what happens to the possible treaty on a 50% reduction.

[Shishlin] I agree with that. But the important thing at the moment, of course, is the fate of the treaty that has been signed. I don't know whether you'll agree with this or not, but it seems to me that January and these first days of February show that the treaty has a quite firm and reliable chance of getting through the U.S. Senate. Although the issue is being fairly hotly disputed, and there are some rabid opponents of the treaty among U.S. politicians, like Senator Helms, still, in one way or another, I think the general picture is rather optimistic here. It looks as if somewhere around April or May, it is quite possible that the Senate will recommend ratification of the treaty.

[Bogdanov] I agree with you, Nikolay Vladimirovich. I'll go further and venture a little prediction. If listeners remember the figure I'm about to mention—and return to it some time later, I may have a red face, or, on the contrary, I may be very proud of having guessed the result of the Senate vote—I think there will be about 12 to 18 votes against. This is the group of diehard senators led by Jesse Helms whom you mentioned, who'll vote against, no matter what. There is just one thing I would like to add: The treaty is, of course, invulnerable. You'll have noticed that the administration is—I'm not afraid to use this word—fighting like a lion for the treaty. The defense secretary, Weinberger, [as heard] who is known for his very hawkish sympathies, has in principle supported this treaty.

[Levin] Even Perle.

[Bogdanov] Even Perle. Let me ask you this: What's happening? Why is this happening? What exactly is being decided in this tussle over the treaty? And I want to come back to the remark I made when you broached this subject. Probably no one in the Senate has any doubt that this is a cast-iron treaty which is sure to go through. What's at issue is the future, the future of two things: Of Soviet-U.S. relations genrallly—whether there'll be a consolidation of the trend toward realizing that with the Soviet Union it is necessary to negotiate and resolve all conflicts by treaty; and then there's the second question, which is the fate of the 50% treaty.

[Shishlin] And the third question is the election campaign.

[Bogdanov] Quite right. It has invaded the entire picture very powerfully and even scrambled the cards somewhat. Take the usual calculations and expectations: How would this or that person have acted, minus the election campaign? Everything might have been different. But evidently, what the rightwingers are planning is to hang amendments on the treaty—not the killer amendments, they won't get through—but amendments that will operate against the treaty on a 50% cut, or at least drag out as long as possible the process of drawing it up and signing it. That, I think, is the significance of the battles now being fought in the Senate.

[Levin] I think it's very indicative, of course: You mentioned Weinberger, but one could name four more former defense secretaries. It's instructive that these men, who headed the Pentagon for many years and contributed in varying ways to the approach to the problems that now exist between the Soviet Union and the United States, have today been unanimous in their support of the treaty. To Weinberger can be added Brown, Schlesinger, McNamara, and Richardson. Whereas, say, Robert McNamara may be, according to the U.S. classification, a little closer perhaps to the doves, Schlesinger is certainly one of the hawks. True, he said in the Senate committee that some people have seen this treaty as the successful culmination of a long and difficult process, while others have regarded it as the beginning of the process of undermining NATO. I think both of those points of view are to some degree correct—that is, that both things seem to be true. But at the same time he says that nevertheless, the senators should have no hesitation in ratifying the intermediate- and shorter range missile treaty, that it is the right treaty. When persons of such authority speak in support of the treaty, it makes an impression, of course. But I think the senators are also being influenced by public opinion.

[Shishlin] I hope listeners will have noticed that this is a winter of great diplomatic activity. The British prime minister, Margaret Thatcher, has just had a meeting with West German Chancellor Kohl; there have been a number of other meetings: Mitterrand has had a meeting with Kohl, and also with Thatcher. Interestingly, all the communiques begin with support for the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. This broad, favorable political background for the treaty will, of course, affect the fate of the ratification process in the Soviet Union, although of course, in the Foreign Affairs Commissions both of the Soviet of the Union and of the Soviet of Nationalities, the treaty will be assessed very carefully indeed. It will be assessed comprehensively, from every standpoint.

[Bogdanov] An interesting thing that I would like to comment on, if I may, is this: Just this morning I was reading in a serious U.S. journal, FOREIGN POLICY, a no less serious analytical article on Reagan's presidency. That article said that it is now perfectly clear that the 1984 election, in which Reagan won the presidency for the second time, and with a very high result—which was seen as a mandate to continue his revolution—was in fact a mandate for him to pursue a policy of limiting and stopping the arms race. Today that has become quite plain. So that is how the question of the public's mood is being assessed today, and not only the public but the ruling circles of the United States and of Western Europe.

[Shishlin] Yes, of course, there is a very noticeable shift generally taking place in the United States, and it is, indeed, a shift toward the center. It is not toward any kind of liberal position—the liberals are still out of fashion—but, of course, the extreme right is now losing its popularity.

[Levin] Let me return again, then, to the question of the U.S. public's position and quote the results of the latest poll. It shows that 79% of respondents approve of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, with only 17% against. There was another very interesting element in that poll, which I think is worth looking at. The question was asked: How do Americans feel about the Soviet Union? Forty-eight percent of those polled said the Soviet Union

cannot be trusted when it comes to concluding agreements. Forty-three percent expressed the opposite opinion and said we can be trusted. These figures do not look particularly optimistic at first glance: Most Americans think we are not to be trusted.

[Bogdanov] [chuckles] But when you talk about a majority, it is of 3% or something. Incidentally, in an opinion poll, the margin of error, plus or minus, is 3% or 4% one way or the other. So I would treat that correlation with great caution.

[Levin] Radomir Georgiyevich, we will get a clearer picture if we look at past polls, and then we will see that a very serious change of attitude has been occurring. In November 1985—practically 3 years ago—when a similar poll asked the same questions, only 24% said they trusted the Soviet Union, and 66% said they did not. That movement gives us reason to conclude that in many respects Americans are changing their ideas. They have begun to look at us not from the standpoint of anti-Soviet stereotypes, not from the standpoint of their attitude toward the evil empire, but from a more realistic standpoint. Of course, an enormous process still lies ahead, but it is happening, and that is encouraging.

[Bogdanov] I think you have touched on one of the most important international questions. What has happened? What is the reason? Why are there these qualitative changes in U.S. sentiment?

[Shishlin] Well, everyone has his own answer to that question. I think the changes that are happening have been influenced to a decisive degree by the revolutionary changes happening in our country.

[Bogdanov] Of course, of course. We have become—our internal affairs—a very major factor in international politics. That is a new phenomenon for us and for the world.

[Shishlin] Certainly. We are beginning to acquire that force of example that was unfortunately very gravely weakened in certain years. In that sense, changes within our country do, of course, play a crucial role: changes that have, in effect, benen continued by the changes that have been a feature of our foreign policy over the past 3 years. However, it goes without saying—and you know this better than I do, Vladimir Georgiyevich—that changes in the U.S. domestic situation are also having their effect, insofar as in general the United States is also beginning to be aware—and the ruling class is also starting to realize this—that if they go on whipping up intecnational tension and take a line of confrontation—hard confrontation—with the Soviet Union on a basis of power, the economic state of affairs in the United states will suffer seriously. It is significant that for the last 3—maybe 4—years, we have seen that, huge though the U.S. military budget is, it has hardly been increasing.

[Bogdanov] I'd even say it's begun to fall. It's probably not without interest to mention that with the advent of the new defense secretary, Carlucci, the decision has been taken to cut the U.S. military budget for 1989 by $33 billion. That's quite a considerable sum.

[Shishlin] Yes. This brings us, no doubt, not simply to the fact that the U.S.-Soviet dialogue is continuing and taking on a certain dynamism. Of course, here it's appropriate to recall that a meeting has been scheduled between the defense ministers of our two states; that's something new...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] I'd even say unprecedented.

[Shishlin] Well, not entirely unprecedented. Soviet and U.S. military men have met...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] During the war.

[Shishlin] Yes. Now it's been agreed that there will be a meeting in Switzerland, in Berne, between Comrade Yazov and...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Mr Carlucci.

[Shishlin] Yes, with Mr Carlucci. And Comrade Akhromeyev, first deputy defense minister and chief of staff, is to visit the United States. U.S. military personnel will be visiting our country, and a number of other serious events are planned, which will be of a purely military nature.

[Bogdanov] These are all manifestations of the new thinking.

[Shishlin] Yes.

[Bogdanov] Three years ago, what you're now saying, if you'd asked me, Nikolay Vladimirovich, whether it was possible or not, I'd have said with a clear conscience, no, no [chuckles] that's impossible! Yet today, it's a reality.

[Shishlin] In this instance, I know that certain pessimists among our comrades, among our colleagues, who'd been insisting that we'd never be able to reach an agreement with Reagan, and that it was pointless to carry on a dialogue with this administration, have now found a very good argument to justify their former stance: that we couldn't have foreseen that such changes would occur in the Soviet Union. [laughter]

[Levin] These are all, of course, very important features. Indeed, the internal changes in the Soviet Union are making a very strong impression on the whole world, although it is still more of an advance payment on changes here, in the main. In the West, they believe that we have only just begun, and we also believe that we have only just begun. As for how the restructuring process will develop, a lot depends on the minds of the

people. But if I may return to the contacts now developing in the military sphere—indeed, not 3 years ago but even 1 year ago, I honestly would not have brought myself to say that Soviet specialists would be at the U.S. nuclear test sites in Nevada and U.S. specialists would be coming to the nuclear test site in Semipalatinsk. Even imagining that such visits were possible, I would not have brought myself to say that the sides would go so far in these contacts, as regards providing the other side with very serious data. Not everything is being opened up there: This was the first visit, but, as one can see from remarks made both by the U.S. specialists who visited us and by our comrades who were in Nevada, the degree of frankness [otkrovennost] was very high, very high.

[Shishlin] But in case our listeners should form a totally rosy impression of Soviet-U.S. relations...

[Levin, interrupting] I should like to return once more to the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and to note that recently certain circles in the United States—and these are circles in the Pentagon, moreover—have made two attempts at obstructing this treaty. First, we were reproached for allegedly not providing the correct photograph, after which appropriate explantions were given there and everything returned to normal. Then a statement appeared from the Defense Department, saying that the Soviet Union allegedly had 160 more intermediate-range missiles than it had stated in the protocol to the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. It turned out that the Americans were working on the basis of the number of launchers. Since there can be two missiles for each launcher—one on the launcher and the other in reserve—they simply doubled arithmetically the number of these launchers. But we did not have those missiles. They mentioned a figure of 810—we have fewer than that, and the data which we gave corresponded exactly to reality.

[Bogdanov] Talking of the fact that...

[Shishlin, interrupting] We have already talked in detail about this in the statement by the spokesman for the ministry...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] But do you know, esteemed colleagues, the thought that has occurred to me now? We have probably got a certain kind of complex. We said we gave a factual statement of what is going on in Soviet-U.S. relations, then suddenly we had a feeling that we might be running too far ahead, too rosy...[Bogdanov changes thought] although we had simply made a statement of what had happened. Incidentally, everything that has happened includes the part played by our immense efforts. I am simply thinking of whether at some point the time will come when we shall say calmly, without any complexes, that this is how Soviet-U.S. relations stand.

[Shishlin] But I think that it is absolutely objective if we say that, all the same, at the negotiations at Geneva on working out a treaty on a 50% reduction of strategic offensive arms under observance of the regime of the ABM Treaty and nonwithdrawal from it for a definite, agreed period, things are, all the same, proceeding neither well nor badly. Individual optimistic and rosy-colored pictures appearing in the Western press, claiming that the Soviet and U.S. representatives there are almost about to approach the home stretch, are far removed from reality. There are still very many complex, unresolved issues there. In this sense, I consider that the chances of putting this treaty together in its final form for signing—although they exist, the chances of putting it together...

[Levin, interrupting] For Reagan's visit...

[Shishlin, interrupting] Yes, for the visit, for the visit by the President of the United States...

[Levin, interrupting] At the end of May or the beginning of June, roughly.

[Shishlin] But these chances, I believe, are less than the chances of the opposite nature.

[Bogdanov] I agree with you, but let me express this supposition. This supposition is not a guess but a supposition based on some objective things. I think that the braking going on in Geneva is connected with two things—first, with the still uncertain nature of the internal arrangement of forces in the United States, and second, with the fate of the treaty's ratification. I believe that, as soon as it is determined what is going to happen in the Republican and Democratic Parties and who will be moving toward the White House—and that is not far off—and how and with what amendments the INF Treaty will be ratified, anyway, then movement on this treaty will commence. Don't you think that there is some good basis for my ideas?

[Shishlin] There is, without any doubt. But, if we simply imagine the chronology of 1988, it will be possible to complete the ratification process in April, by the most optimistic assessments. As Viktor Nikolayevich has already mentioned, the visit by the President of the United States to Moscow is planned for the end of May or the beginning of June. So, I feel that it will be difficult to count on working out a treaty in the period between April and May if some strong movement forward does not appear now, in February and March. I think that, in this sense, the forthcoming visit to Moscow by George Shultz will clarify something.

It is known that there is an accord that the two ministers of foreign affairs, the Soviet and the American—regardless of the fact that in the United States he is called the secretary of state—will meet each month up to the summit meeting on Soviet soil. So, it is necessary to work with our sleeves rolled up here, as they say. Although I

say that the chances that we will manage to work out this treaty before Reagan's visit are fewer, there still remains some chance. Therefore, a realistic look at the state of affairs here must lead to one conclusion: that at these negotiations, the Geneva negotiations, any pause at all there, of whatever nature, is quite simply intolerable.

[Levin] A pause must not be permitted in any area. Also very important is a factor now also being noted in Europe, the fact that there is a desire to move forward on a wide range of issues. But at the same time, you understand, people—and not only people, probably, but politicians also—need concrete results. Undoubtedly, if the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting—already the fourth meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan—were to be crowned with the signing of a treaty on a 50% reduction of strategic offensive arms, that would be a gigantic step forward, gigantic.

[Shishlin] So, that is the key problem.

[Levin] Yes.

[Bogdanov] Perhaps we would say then that a fundamental improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations had occurred.

[Shishlin] Without a doubt.

[Levin] In the meantime, we are only proceeding toward this. The treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, for all its significance, is a first step breaking into the sphere of nuclear disarmament, but it is a step that embraces something of the order of 4% of all nuclear arms, while here we are talking of gigantic figures from among the most serious types of weapon. But, at the same time, a question occurs very often, in spite of the fact that an answer has been given to it.

Once again, recently, at a briefing in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a Japanese correspondent, if my memory does not deceive me, asked this question: Is the preparation of a treaty on a 50% reduction of strategic offensive arms an absolute condition for Reagan's visit to Moscow? Our answer was again, the one that had been given earlier: No, it is not. We very much want this treaty to come about, but we are not making such a linkage. We understand full well that this treaty is a very serious, very complex thing. It would be wrong to impose any strict time limits on working it out, probably, because the foundation must be the quality of the treaty and not the time taken on preparing—although I will repeat once more that no time must be wasted here, either. Time must not be wasted either, under any circumstances.

[Bogdanov] But you know we are not at all wasting time. We now work with the administration that is on its way out until the very last day, as opposed to what we used to do. I think that we will work with it for as long as this President resides in the White House. We are now not wasting the 18 months that used to be wasted because of the beginning of an election campaign. The logic of my argument amounts to this: Supposing we fail to complete the treaty by the time Reagan arrives in Moscow, undoubtedly a substantial foundation for this treaty will have been built. The fact that we are consistently maintaining our pace, working with this administration until its very last day, shows that we will maintain the same pace when working with the next administration, which will start its term in the White House on 20 January 1989.

[Shishlin] There is something else to be said in addition to your comment, Radomir Georgiyevich. During the Washington talks, it is precisely the forthcoming treaty on the 50% reduction of strategic offensive weapons that came in for most of the attention, and progress was considerable. This is actually what Mikhail Sergeyevich talked about at the news conference. Later he repeated this in his speech on Soviet television. So even here we think that things are generally moving forward. Yes, they are progressing. Perhaps it is necessary to revive the pace of the actual talks in Geneva. Their rhythm must be more flexible.

[Bogdanov, interrupting] We must speed up.

[Shishlin] Yes.

[Levin] But I would also like to point out that this is roughly what the leaders of many West European states are calling for as well. Recently debates on the government statement outlined in Helmut Kohl's speech were held in the West German Bundestag. In this statement he said this, inter alia: Under conditions of a tangible development in East-West relations, Europeans must help to expand cooperation and strengthen confidence-building measures. When talking about the tangible increase, he primarily meant the signing of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. We know that without other countries' participation, without the GDR, CSSR, FRG, it would have been considerably more difficult to disentangle a whole range of knots that emerged while the INF Treaty was being prepared. They helped. They are now also expressing a wish to further the processes of developing good relations and arms limitation. Unfortunately, I could not venture to speak for all European states, but many European states...

[Shishlin, interrupting] Let us say, most of them...

[Levin] Undoubtedly, most of them have been expressing this aspiration. It is noteworthy that when the United Nations disarmament committee resumed its proceedings this week, they began by discussing in particular the matter of banning chemical weapons. Appeals for this treaty to be signed as soon as possible were unanimous. FRG Foreign Minister Genscher advocated that this treaty should be signed as soon as possible. Italian Foreign Minister Andreotti also spoke, as well as representatives of the socialist countries. What is significant

here is that in their speeches, many Western representatives have directly pointed out who is holding back the preparation of the treaty, namely the United States. They reproach the United States for adopting an inconsistent posiiton, that is for initiating the production of binary weapons and the bomb that is to be filled with these binary chemical weapons. This position runs contrary to the main direction and obstructs the process.

[Shishlin] But I think that not only the United States can be reproached for this, although the reproach addressed to the United States is justified. Britain can also be reproached. It did not play a very good role at the talks on banning chemical weapons. Now, looking over its shoulder at Washington, it is just showing indifference. But above all, one should mention France.

[Levin] France perhaps deserves a special reproach and, unfortunately, not just in this repect. But it is primarily France that I had in mind when I said: not all West European states. The actual general atmosphere, however, is very characteristic. It seems to me that it also—not even also but undoubtedly—gives grounds for optimism. One wants to look at the future a little. Even if the treaty on the 50% reduction of strategic offensive weapons is not ready by the time Reagan is due to visit the USSR, the actual visit will undoubtedly become a very important step in the development of Soviet-U.S. relations, in other words, in creating a generally favorable atmosphere for tackling radical questions.

[Shishlin] Adding more optimism, Viktor Nikolayevich, I would like to say that in any case, both diplomats and politicians will have an extra day in 1988. This year we have February 29th, this being a leap year.

[Bogdanov] Nikolay Vladimirovich, perhaps this day will be just enough for the major events of the current year.

[Levin] Well, I must say that never in the past 4 years have we been as optimistic as we are now. But there are definitely grounds for this optimism. Thank you, esteemed listeners, for your attention. All the best to you.

United States & Canada

Shultz in Seattle Comments on Relations

LD072106 Moscow TASS in English 2036 GMT 7 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 7 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko:

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has made a speech on U.S.-Soviet relations at the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies in Seattle.

"The U.S.-Soviet relationship is as important as it is unique," he said. "It is important because we each bear an immense burden of leadership in the world. It is unique because the nuclear era demands that we engage each other despite our profound differences."

The U.S. secretary of state said that the U.S.-Soviet relations had improved and were marked by a distinct trend towards positive development. He described the signing of the INF Treaty as one of the main signs of these improved relations.

"We have made important strides toward conclusion of a treaty that would cut in half the U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear arsenals...and we have established regular exchanges of views on regional conflicts, human rights and humanitarian issues," Shultz went on to say.

"We have breathed new life into a programme of bilateral cooperative programs ranging from people-to-people contacts among young people, to improved air service between the U.S. and USSR, to scientific, cultural and educational exchanges."

"This is," Shultz emphasised, "a hopeful beginning to a long and purposeful effort to establish a new pattern of more constructive relations."

According to Shultz, during the Washington summit, President Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev "identified additional areas where the two sides have much to contribute to each other", some of which involved "bilateral and multilateral efforts to study the consequences of changes in the global climate and environment, to explore the prospects for nuclear fusion as an unlimited source of energy, and to harness the potential of such areas of increasing importance as the Arctic."

Shultz believes that at present the Soviet Union and the United States have "greater opportunities than ever before to achieve balanced, effective and verifiable arms control agreements...which will impart greater stability and predictability to...the U.S.-Soviet relations."

"The change in the tempo of U.S.-Soviet relations is also occuring as part of larger transformation of our world. The U.S.-Soviet relationship both influences and is deeply affected by these changes."

According to Shultz both countries have to "seek steady progress toward a more open, more predictable, more stable and constructive relationship. He stressed the need for the United States and the Soviet Union to find points of contact on all major issues without any "linkage" to other issues. [quotation marks as received]

"We do not accept", the secretary of state said, "the assumption that linkages can be applied indiscriminately", though the United States has resorted to it more than once, and "linkage as practised in the past has not worked."

Touching upon the current restructuring of Soviet society, Shultz said: "We should welcome change in the Soviet Union—and wish the Soviet people well—precisely to the extent the Soviet effort at modernization squares with American hopes for a safer world and a more productive U.S.-Soviet relationship."

However, the secretary did not avoid old and worn-out stereotypes, such as assertions that the United States was determined to "encourage the growth of democracy throughout the world" which in practice means intent to interfere in other countries' affairs, or U.S. intentions to continue its military buildup allegedly for strengthening peace.

Shultz attributed all changes for the better exclusively to the efforts of the United States and its allies. It is noteworthy that while recognising the pressing need of working out an agreement reducing by half U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenals, Shultz confirmed in the same stride the Reagan administration's determination to continue a "vigorous SDI programme" to militarize outer space, whose implementation would disrupt all chances of radical offensive nuclear arms cuts.

'Stereotypes' in Speech Hit

PM081113 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Feb 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "We Have Breathed in New Life"]

[Text] Washington, 6 Feb—U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz has delivered a speech devoted to Soviet-American relations at the Washington University School of International Studies in Seattle. He emphasized that these relations are "important and unique." "They are important because both countries bear the enormous burden of world leadership. They are unique because the nuclear age demands that we collaborate despite our profound differences."

The secretary of state expressed the view that USSR-U.S. relations have improved and are following a distinct trend toward positive development. He cited the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the possibility which has emerged of elaborating an agreement on 50% cuts in strategic offensive arms, and the discussion on a regular

basis of regional conflicts, humanitarian questions, and human rights problems as the main evidence of this. "We have breathed new life into the program of bilateral cooperation projects that span the most varied spheres, from youth contacts to the improvement of USSR-U.S. air communications, as well as scientific and cultural exchanges and exchanges in the area of education." All this, Shultz stressed, is a "promising beginning to long-term, purposeful efforts to create a new model of more constructive relations" between the USSR and the United States. During the Soviet-American summit in Washington M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President R. Reagan identified additional areas for the future development of cooperation.

The secretary of state's speech also contained old, obsolete stereotypes such as assurances about U.S. determination "to promote the triumph of democracy throughout the world"—which, as is known, in practice means attempts to interfere in the affairs of other countries. This also applies to the declared U.S. intention to buildup up its military might, allegedly with a view to "strengthening peace."

West's 'Dynamism' Questioned

LD071718 Moscow TASS in English 1651 GMT 7 Feb 88

[Text] New York February 7 TASS—The United States Secretary of State George Shultz spoke at the School of International Studies in Seattle and displaying a snobbish attitude that must be a leftover of the times when he was a practicing lawyer remarked that "the changes now taking place in the communist world are...a halting and anxious attempt to catch up to the dynamism and creativity of the West".

As to "dynamism and creativity", judging by what observers have to say, its most patent manifestation was the Iran-contras scandal which reflected the entire decay of the so called American democracy. This scandal witnessed violations of the American Constitution, deception of Congress, disregard for American laws and the creation of a secret mechanism for organising subversive actions abroad and overthrowing lawful governments.

True, as it was repeatedly stated by the U.S. secretary of state, he had objected against the sale of arms to Iran and for this reason did not consider himself an accomplice in the Iran-contras affair. But this did not prevent the secretary of state from personally asking the sultan of Brunei to donate ten million dollars as aid to the bands of Nicaraguan contras. This money was intended for the company called Enterprise and managed by Lieutenant Oliver North. And this money was provided contrary to the Boland Amendment adopted by Congress.

There is detailed data on this fact in the report of the congressional commissions that investigated the Iran-contras affair. It is said in the book "The Chronology: The Documented Day-by-Day Account of the Secret Military Assistance to Iran and the Contras" that the three-hour meeting between Shultz and the sultan of Brunei took place on June 24, 1986 and that after it the sultan transferred ten million dollars for the contras to an account in a Swedish bank.

Shultz, Crowe Remarks on INF Treaty Cited

LD051330 Moscow TASS in English 1315 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 5 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz spoke on Thursday before the participants in the 9th annual convention of the American Friends of Turkey Organisation.

Dwelling, in particular, upon the questions relating to the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty, he stressed that that agreement was "a great achievement". "For the first time," George Shultz stated, "we have negotiated an agreement that reduces nuclear weapons." The head of the U.S. foreign policy department claimed that the treaty was largely due to the "strength and unity" of NATO. His speech also contained allegations about the Soviet threat to "the free world". Speaking of the prospects for the arms control process, George Shultz stressed the need for "a more stable and constructive relationship with the Soviet Union", stating at the same time that negotiations with the Soviet Union "must proceed from strength".

The same position of conducting negotiations from strength was expressed by William Crowe, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He was giving testimony at the hearings at the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations which continues discussing the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty. He stressed, in particular, that even after the full implementation of the provisions of the treaty the USA will retain a whole range of possibilities for pursuing the strategy of flexible reaction. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff had in mind the nearly 4,000 nuclear warheads which NATO will still possess after the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles. Moreover, as was stressed during the hearings on more than one occasion, the tactical nuclear weapons, their delivery systems and NATO's conventional armed forces must be modernised. Those plans, Admiral Crowe said, spanned a good bridge into the future.

Senators Send Letter to Shultz on INF Treaty

LD070957 Moscow TASS in English 0856 GMT 7 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 7 TASS—The leaders of the Democrats in the U.S. Senate have sent a letter to U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, urging the administration to guarantee that "a meaning for the treaty different from that presented to the Senate by the Reagan administration cannot be adopted without the approval of the Senate".

The letter was signed by Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd and Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman Sam Nunn.

The current 'legislative procedure dispute' between the Democratic leadership of the Senate and the U.S. Department of State reflects the Democrats' concern over the Reagan administration's approach to interpretation of the Soviet-U.S. treaties, which manifested itself first of all in the administration's decision that the so-called "broad" reading of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM) was legally correct.

Mr. Nunn stated in the letter that if the administration still adhered to such position and did not regard the Senate testimony by administration officials on the INF Treaty as legally binding, the Senate must "exhaustively scrutinise" the INF negotiating record and write its own understanding of the treaty's meaning—a process that will be "unwieldy and time-consuming" and "could undermine the ratification process".

U.S. Adversaries Try 'To Torpedo' INF Accord

LD051748 Moscow TASS in English 1528 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 5 TASS—Adversaries of the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles step up the efforts to torpedo the Soviet-American agreement during the hearings in the Senate committees of the U.S. Congress.

Former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle, notorious for his strong opposition to any steps in arms control area taken by the Soviet Union and the United States, attacked the treaty in the Senate Arms Services Committee on Thursday.

He submitted a report which calls in question the system of verification and control envisaged by the treaty. Perle expressed support for the aims of the Soviet-American treaty but insisted on the need for amendments and reservations, even if this necessitated the holding of new talks by the sides. In other words, he actually called for burying the treaty in that form in which it was signed.

Ultra conservative Senator Jesse Helms immediately supported Perle's pronouncements and assumed the lead of the ultra-right-wing's campaign against the treaty. He submitted two amendments in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. They, specifically, include the proposals to annul the treaty automatically if the United States catches the Soviet Union at "deception." Helms had earlier made an attempt to get consent of the Pentagon's representatives to his stand, but without success. Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force General Larry Welch made it plain that he has no doubts about the reliability or the verification system established in accordance with the INF Treaty.

According to the estimates of the U.S. press, not more than 10-12 senators now express the readiness to vote against the treaty. And 67 out of 100 votes from the complete composition of the Senate is enough to endorse the treaty. The adversaries of the Soviet-American treaty hope to achieve their aim by "killer-amendments" which can be adopted by a simple majority vote, but they can torpedo the treaty.

U.S. Forms Nuclear Arms On-Site Inspection Group

LD061710 Moscow TASS in English 1637 GMT 6 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 6 TASS—The U.S. Defence Department on Friday announced the formation of a new agency to verify compliance with the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Nuclear Missiles.

The Pentagon said the on-site inspection agency would be responsible for conducting and overseeing inspections of nuclear weapons sites.

The Pentagon announcement said the agency should be ready to operate by April 1.

Army Brigadier General Roland Lajoie, now the U.S. military attache in Paris, has been appointed to head the new agency.

According to preliminary estimates, its staff will include 700 to 800 military and civilian personnel.

Carlucci Comments on NATO at FRG Conference

LD072115 Moscow TASS in English 1949 GMT 7 Feb 88

[Text] Bonn February 7 TASS—The second and last day of the international conference organised in Munich by the Wehrkunde West German military-scientific society was keynoted by calls for NATO to rearm in the field of both conventional and nuclear weapons. Prominent representatives of NATO's military and political circles gathered at the conference to discuss the North Atlantic Alliance's strategy in the new conditions after the signing of the Soviet-American treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles.

The U.S. Secretary for Defense Frank Carlucci addressed the conference and set forth a large-scale programme of measures to build up NATO's conventional and nuclear armaments, to develop new and modernise existing systems. He flatly rejected the possibility of a "third zero option" and the creation of a nuclear-free Europe and supported the strategy of nuclear deterrence. He demanded that the allies make additional efforts to build up conventional armaments, increase allocations for military needs and expand cooperation in the creation of new military hardware.

Dwelling on Washington's role in the NATO bloc Frank Carlucci said that his country did not intend to carry out any substantial reductions of the American troops stationed in Western Europe and confirmed the U.S. nuclear guarantees to West European countries. The head of the Pentagon stressed the need of allied support in the question of preserving the system of military bases.

Another American representative, General John Galvin who is the NATO supreme military commander in Europe, also called for increasing the North Atlantic Alliance's arsenals and military might.

A restrained approach to assessing the prospects of fulfilling plans of rearmament and modernising various types of weapons was displayed by the Chairman of the Christian Social Union Franz-Josef Strauss. He voiced serious doubts that the plans to modernise the bloc's armed forces would gain the support of broad sections of the population in West European countries. The public in the West is showing an increasingly favourable attitude to Soviet policy, he said.

Egon Bahr, an expert on questions of disarmament of West Germany's main opposition party—the Social Democratic Party, said he was against the modernisation of nuclear missiles with a range of less than 500 kilometres. He said it was necessary to conduct talks on this type of armaments.

The conference ended its work tonight.

Utah 'Bigeye' Bacteriological Weapon Lab Planned
PM081221 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Feb 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the rubric "Press Attests": "Dangerous Program"]

[Text] The U.S. Army command has announced its intention to build a laboratory in the Utah desert to develop new types of bacteriological weapons. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the creation of the laboratory, which will be fitted with the most modern equipment, will create a potential for experimenting with means of bacteriological warfare that carry a threat of mass infectious diseases.

According to the newspaper, some $5.4 million has already been allocated for implementation of the project. It is planned that the new laboratory will "make it possible to substantially expand not only research programs but tests on deadly bacteria obtained through genetic engineering." These include anthrax, tularemia, encephalitis, and other disease pathogens. It is also planned to test defenses against bacteriological warfare.

This report followed the adoption by President Reagan of a decision to initiate production of the "Bigeye" binary aerial bomb, one of three types of new-generation chemical weapons whose production has either begun or is planned to begin very soon in the United States. In mid-December last year, the assembly of binary munitions for artillery began, and developments of binary warheads for multiple rocket launchers are under way.

Furthermore, the Pentagon report submitted to the Senate this January talks of plans to further build up NATO's tactical nuclear forces and conventional arms.

Project 'Irresponsible'
PM081241 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 4

[B. Ivanov article under the rubric "Apt Remarks": "Against Common Sense"]

[Text] U.S. President R. Reagan has informed Congress of his decision to sanction the start of production of the "Bigeye" binary chemical aerial bomb, intended for the U.S. Air Force.

"Bigeye" is not simply another type of ammunition that will soon reinforce U.S. arsenals—it is part of a new generation of weapons. It marks the latest qualitative spiral in the creation of mass destruction systems. The Pentagon plans to begin full-scale production of this type of weapon in 1990. Binary artillery shells, the assembling of which began in December last year at a plant built specially for this purpose close to the small town of Pine Bluff in Arkansas, and now the "Bigeye" aerial bombs, are just the tip of the "chemical" iceberg. In the future—and those on the Potomac make no secret of this—binary warheads for multiple rocket launchers, warheads for certain types of cruise missiles and "air to surface" missiles, and other types of ammunition will be coming off the production lines.

These actions by the American side, which are completely unprovoked, certainly do not tally with statements by high-ranking figures in the U.S. Government, and by Secretary of State G. Shultz in particular, concerning Washington's "sincere" intention and desire to take practical disarmament measures and reduce the threat of war. These militarist steps also do not tie in with the results and the spirit of the Soviet-American summit meeting, during which Washington assured everyone that it was committed to the "task of working out a comprehensive, effective international convention, subject to verification, to ban and eliminate chemical weapons."

The new stage in the chemical arms race undertaken across the ocean will certainly be a considerable impediment to the Geneva talks on banning chemical weapons, where the text of the relevant convention is virtually already decided. To all appearances, this is being done with the direct blessing of the head of the American Administration. How else, other than as a desire to spin out the Geneva talks or even derail them completely, can one interpret statements by the master of the White

House that the main thing as far as the United States is concerned is not to eliminate chemical weapons but level out the alleged imbalance in this sphere in Moscow's favor—naturally, by means of a chemical arms upgrading? As is well-known, the Soviet Union has made known the size of its own chemical arsenal (50,000 tonnes), although the United States has refused to provide analogous data. At the same time, according to experts, more than 55,000 tonnes of toxic substances are stockpiled at American military depots. As we can see, if there is any imbalance, it is in Washington's favor.

Attempts by the American side to justify the start of binary ammunition production by arguing that this will be a "good incentive" which, they say, will spur Moscow on to work out a convention banning chemical weapons as soon as possible, are also extremely far-fetched. Let me remind you that surely it was the USSR that proposed fundamentally new approaches to the problem of eliminating chemical weapons and drew up proposals on the procedure for eliminating chemical ammunition? Surely it was the USSR that proposed a complex of specific measures to monitor implementation of the future convention, including mandatory on-site inspection? Finally, surely it was the USSR that displayed goodwill by inviting the participants in the Geneva talks to a military installation at Shikhany, where they were shown examples of chemical ammunition in service and the procedure for its destruction? Surely this is evidence of the Soviet side's desire to see a successful conclusion to the Geneva talks as soon as possible.

And so, the green light has been given to production of the "Bigeye" bomb. This is a dangerous, irresponsible step.

'Serious Defects' Noted in 'Trident-1' System

LD070728 Moscow TASS in English 0719 GMT 7 Feb 88

[Text] New York February 7 TASS—A test of the Trident-1 intercontinental ballistic missile last Saturday ended in failure. After it was launched off a submerged submarine it became clear that there existed serious defects in the functioning of on-board systems. The missile flew for 18 minutes over the Atlantic Ocean, and after that a self-destruction system switched in over Florida state.

It was the 29th test launch of the ICBM off a submarine. Each missile is capable of delivering 10 MIRVS to a distance of over 7,000 km.

Launch of 'Delta' Rocket Postponed

LD052239 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 5 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The launch of a Delta rocket from Cape Canaveral in Florida as part of the Star Wars program has been postponed because of a failure in the oxygen supply system for the rocket's second stage. The Delta rocket is intended to launch into outer space 11 satellites and 4 missiles, which will play the role of missiles of an imaginary enemy. The latest sensors aboard the Delta and satellites will provide detection, tracking, and homing to the space interceptors' missiles. It is proposed to spend more than $200 million to carry out the experiment.

'Terrorist' Appointed to UN Rights Commission

PM081403 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Yevg. Bay article: "With Dynamite Clutched to His Breast"]

[Text] "Armando Valladares, the head of our delegation, who spent more than 20 years in Cuban jails as a political prisoner, has witnessed man's striving for freedom and the spiritual strength of prisoners of conscience. His character and single-mindedness will be of excellent service to our diplomacy. . . ." (From a statement by U.S. President R. Reagan on 30 January 1988).

If the American Administration ever intended to send an official representative to the Sicilian Mafia, it would be hard to find a better candidate. Armando Valladares, a former member of the dictator Batista's secret police (Batista was responsible for the deaths of 20,000 Cuban patriots) was arrested after the victory of the revolution for planting bombs in Havana stores. Valladares subsequently served 23 years in jail (not as a political prisoner but as a terrorist). He would be a perfectly competent, experienced U.S. representative among the Mafia. The administration has decreed otherwise, however. Mr Valladares was recently made head of the American delegation to the UN Commission on Human Rights, whose latest scheduled session is currently in progress in Geneva.

Perhaps this is just a tragic mistake? Evidently the President has simply not been told about the service record of this "prisoner of conscience," who "symbolizes mankind's striving for freedom."

It is hard to believe. The biography of the terrorist is well-known, not only in Cuba but far beyond its borders. Luis Gutierrez Esperanza, a correspondent with the Mexican newspaper EL SOL DE MEXICO, once exclaimed with total justification: "I would be interested to learn the fate of Valladares if he were convicted in the United States for similar crimes. He could certainly expect the electric chair, the gas chamber, or some other form of execution prescribed by American law."

But the law and the presidential will have determined a different path for the terrorist—to "defend" human rights on behalf of the U.S. Government and brand those who "threaten civilized society." Thanks to the efforts of American propaganda, Valladares has not only been given the reputation of a "prisoner of conscience" but

also of a "prominent intellectual" and a "poet" who stoically survived the adversities of jail despite the paralysis that confined him to an invalid chair.

While working in Cuba, along with other foreign journalists I had occasion to see some pictures shot in the jail where Valladares was serving his sentence. The prisoner got up cheerfully in the mornings and did his exercises, squatting and doing pushups without difficulty. The pictures were shown several days before the Cuban Government prepared to release the prisoner in response to the request of a number of West European figures. There was a truly comic scene. The "stoic freedom fighter" who had allegedly been subjected to degradation and mental torture in jail was taken to the airport in an invalid chair. Greeting the journalists gathered there, Valladares gave a tortured smile and raised a shaky arm in the air. Standing stock-still, the public watched to see what would happen next. The former prisoner was wheeled to the aircraft steps, where it was suggested that he continue unaided. The "invalid" stared at the immigration officer in bewilderment, turned to those who had accompanied him, sat in silence for a few seconds, then waved, got up, and eagerly got onto the aircraft. "A Paralytic Without Paralysis and a Poet Without Poetry"—this was the headline given by the Mexican newspaper EXCELSIOR to an article on his release.

...I am holding an information report on the television program "Wide Angle" recently shown in Havana. Valladares' former "colleagues" from Batista's secret police gave statements on the program. One of them was his neighbor in jail, Jose Arbolay Pino. "The idea of Valladares being made a defender of freedom is enough to make you die laughing. When we were in jail, there was only one thing he talked about—how all communists should be killed. They must all be killed, he said, and reds' children should be taken by the legs and smashed against a wall. His other favorite subject," J. Pino continued, "was how to prepare a terrorist act. I learned the details, for example, of how to boobytrap an ordinary tennis ball or cigarette packet. This was how Valladares was responsible for explosions in Havana's biggest stores."

If Washington had an official representative in the "Red Brigades" or the "Baader Meinhof" organization... But no, this professional terrorist is being sent to Geneva to fight for human rights!

His special assignment is to defend human rights in Cuba. True, last year the United States tried to push through an anti-Cuban resolution in Geneva, but it was categorically rejected by the overwhelming majority of states. After this the administration urgently sent its representatives to Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, and other countries to intimidate them with sanctions if they should be insubordinate.

But this has not produced the desired effect, and the United States will bring the slanderous resolution up again. And again, to all appearances, it will have to threaten sanctions. What can you do? Anything goes in the fight for "human rights." Recalcitrant states can be punished by stripping them of their credit and a terrorist can be made the main person responsible for defending human rights. All we can do is sit back and wait for him to "be of excellent service to American diplomacy due to his single-mindedness."

China

Soviet, PRC Officials Meet on Latin America

LD081056 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1045 GMT 8 Feb 88

[Text] Beijing, 8 Feb (TASS)—Within the framework of the periodic consultations on international problems of mutual interest, a meeting between representatives of the USSR and PRC foreign ministries took place in Beijing to exchange opinions on topical problems of the Latin American situation.

CPC Politburo Discusses Economic Reform

PM081155 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Feb 88 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Results Summed Up"]

[Text] Beijing, 7 Feb—The results of the PRC's economic development last year and questions of the need to continue the deepening of economic reform and the ensuring of further stabilization of the economy were examined at a session of the CPC Central Committee Politburo held here. It was chaired by Zhao Ziyang, CPC Central Committee general secretary.

According to XINHUA reports, the session noted that last year, in parallel with increased output by several of the economy's most important sectors, there was a trend toward rising prices for foodstuffs and industrial goods. The Politburo stressed the need to take additional measures to stabilize prices.

Touching on the recently elaborated strategy for the economic development of China's maritime regions, the participants in the session pointed out that it will give new impetus to the economic development of the PRC's central and western regions. They also emphasized the importance of the widest possible introduction of a system of contractual responsibility in the country's enterprises.

Zhao Stresses Importance of Trade Relations

PM040953 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Jan 88 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Strategy for Developing Maritime Regions. China Invites Foreign Partners To Cooperate"]

[Text] Beijing, 26 Jan—China must make maximum use of the cheap work force, favorable transport conditions, established infrastructure, and scientific and technical base in its maritime regions to attract foreign investments, Zhao Ziyang, CPC Central Committee general secretary, has stated. He described the strategy for the economic development of these regions in the course of inspection trips at the end of last year and the beginning of this to Shanghai and Zhejiang, Jiangsu, and Fujian Provinces. An account of these speeches has been published in RENMIN RIBAO.

China's maritime regions must take advantage of the favorable climate in the international arena and do their utmost to develop an export-oriented economy and to participate in international exchange and international competition, the CPC leader pointed out. In using foreign capital particular attention must be paid to attracting investments from foreign businessmen and creating in every possible way enterprises based exclusively on capital from foreign businessmen and also joint enterprises with the participation of Chinese and foreign capital. At the same time the methods of joint operation of Chinese enterprises must be used. These measures will make it possible not only to accelerate the development of the maritime regions themselves but also to boost their economic efficiency. They will promote the further development of the country's central and western regions.

The implementation of this course will be of strategic importance in both economic and also political relations, Zhao Ziyang stressed. China's maritime regions must attach paramount importance—taking into consideration international production cooperation and the presence there of huge manpower resources—to the development of labor-intensive sectors in industry and the creation of enterprises for processing materials supplied by foreign partners.

Talking about the problem of improving the management of industrial enterprises, including joint enterprises, Zhao Ziyang pointed out the need to make use of foreign specialists in managing Chinese enterprises. Using the services of foreign managers benefits both sides. It will permit China, for instance, to "cast off the shackles of the old structure," to "make management more rigorous," to "train modern managers," and to "improve the training of cadre workers and boost their vocational skill." The attraction of foreign investments and technical modernization of enterprises will in turn enable enterprises to emerge onto foreign markets.

"It does not matter who leads an enterprise, the main thing is for it to be beneficial both to the state and the workers and employees of the enterprise in question," Zhao Ziyang stressed, citing as the main methods of enterprise management the contract, rental, and shared participation methods. It is impossible, he pointed out, to switch all the country's industrial enterprises to the new management methods at the same time.

Referring to the problem of reforming the PRC foreign trade system, the CPC Central Committee general secretary indicated the need to create favorable conditions for local organs and local enterprises and the need to eliminate the leveling which now operates in the Chinese foreign trade system.

Northeast Asia

Northern Territories Called Anti-Soviet

LD071940 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 7 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent I. Vykhukholev, identified by screen caption]

[Text] The so-called Northern Territories Day was held in Japan today:

[Vykhukholev] As always it began early in the morning with noisy demonstrations by right-wingers in the streets around the Soviet Embassy. The entire area surrounding it was transformed into a fortress under siege which was defended against endless attacks by fascist-like hooligans by reinforced detachments of the special riot-control police.

The main event, with the important-sounding title of National Congress for the Return of the Four Islands of the Kurile Chain, took place as usual in the Kudan hall near the famous Yasukuni Shrine. This is taking place for the eighth time, with government support. On the platform at the gathering is the prime minister. Paradoxical as it may seem, representatives of all opposition parties are also here. On the issue of the territorial claims they are effectively at one with those whom they oppose in parliament, defending a peaceful and democratic Japan.

But while the official so-called Congress for the Return of the Northern Territories was taking place in the Kudan Hall, a noisy, screaming demonstration passed through the streets around the Soviet Embassy in Tokyo. These lackeys were utterly frank: They called 7 February Anti-Soviet Day. The fact that the territorial claims have been elevated to the status of state policy gives them additional confidence. On days like these adult hooligans swagger to their heart's content, as they say. But this is what is noteworthy: In recent years they have been trying to involve children who are far from bright increasingly in the anti-Soviet campaign. Clearly, with due regard for the long-term future, they are training replacements to

whom this entire unseemly relay-baton can be passed on in time. [video shows children carrying balloons in demonstrating crowd; scuffle among demonstrators]

Takeshita Attends Activities

LD071142 Moscow TASS in English 1133 GMT 7 Feb 88

[Text] Tokyo February 7 TASS—Today the Japanese Government once again held the so-called "Day of Northern Territories". On authorities' instructions, "meetings" were organised in the capital and some other cities in support of the Japanese ruling circles' claims to part of Kurile Islands belonging to the Soviet Union.

An anti-Soviet meeting in Tokyo was attended by Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita, a number of cabinet members, and some parliamentarians. Addressing those present, the head of government once again tried to link the development of steady Soviet-Japanese relations with satisfaction of Tokyo's territorial claims on the USSR.

Takeshita on Right To Discuss U.S. Nuclear Arms

LD071525 Moscow TASS in English 1441 GMT 7 Feb 88

[Text] Tokyo February 7 TASS—TASS correspondent Vasiliy Golovnin reports:

Following an acute conflict in the parliament, the Japanese Government had to acknowledge its right to hold consultations with Washington to discuss the issue concerning the illegal bringing of U.S. nuclear weapons into the country. This is said in a statement made by Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita in reply to repeated inquiries made by deputies from the Socialist Party. The statement has been circulated here.

At the same time the prime minister emphasised that Tokyo did not intend to use the right to consultations now, proceeding from its "friendly relations with the United States."

Tokyo continues to make ambiguous assertions that nuclear weapons are ostensibly 'unloaded somewhere' from U.S. warships before they call at local ports. Such statements were more than once openly disproved by well-informed U.S. political figures, by former U.S. President Jimmy Carter and former U.S. Ambassador to Japan Edwin Reischauer, in particular.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

More on Indonesian Foreign Minister's Visit

Received by Gorbachev

LD051728 Moscow TASS in English 1644 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 5 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev received Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja in the Kremlin today.

Welcoming the guest, Mikhail Gorbachev noted the timeliness of the visit, assessed it as an important event in the development of Soviet-Indonesian relations. He noted with satisfaction the fact that the ties between the two countries have been becoming more dynamic of late, while their contents was [as received] being enriched. This is promoted by the fact that though the two states belong to different socio-political systems they respect the historic choice made by their peoples. Basing itself on new thinking the USSR is prepared to build a new world with every state, and showed this in practice. As far as such a large country as Indonesia is concerned, its contribution to positive processes in the international arena, great as it is, will undoubtedly continue growing. The USSR intends to promote this on the roads of equal, mutually advantageous interaction and cooperation. The Soviet Union's attitude to Indonesia is not subjected to circumstantial considerations.

Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja said that the activity of the Soviet leadership aimed at the relaxation of international tension and disarmament, at the settlement of conflict situations, is welcomed in Indonesia.

Problems of the Asia-Pacific region were discussed in the context of Vladivostok initiative which, as Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized again, does not infringe on the interests of other countries and has no expansionist inclinations. We prove this by our practical steps, by our entire conduct, by the entire style of our diplomatic work. Everybody should know that we shall continue acting in this way.

Two aspects determine the Soviet Union's policy in the Asia-Pacific region: First, the principle of peacefulness and recognition of the equality of states as the basis of international relations. Second, the interests that we would like to realize, honestly combining them with the interests of other countries, accepting and taking into consideration their initiatives, their constructive activity. This applies to all states of the region, including, certainly, such major countries as Indonesia, India, Vietnam, the United States, China, Japan.

The interlocutors assessed the importance of the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles as undoubtedly positive for Asian and Pacific countries.

The proposals on the question of security in Asia and the Pacific advanced in an interview to the newspaper MERDEKA remain valid.

Mikhail Gorbachev welcomed the idea of turning South East Asia into a nuclear weapons free zone. This would be a major step in the beginning of the improvement of the situation in the vast and promising zone of the world.

Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja said that Indonesia is aware of its obligations in the region, in the Non-Aligned Movement, in the international arena. It approaches the settlement of regional conflicts from these positions.

The situation in South East Asia is the subject of our common concern, Mikhail Gorbachev said. The problem of political settlement in Kampuchea which is not only of a regional but also international importance, was discussed in this context. Mikhail Gorbachev spoke highly of the initiative and role of the Republic of Indonesia in this process, its striving to involve all ASEAN member countries and ASEAN as a whole into this process, its constructive contacts with Vietnam.

The question of raising the entire level of bilateral relations was posed as an important question during the conversation. Bilateral readiness to promote this in every way has been expressed. This visit is called upon to serve as a serious political impulse. As to commercial and economic relations, during the days of the visit it would be possible to elucidate the possibilities for the development of trade and for the establishment of its new forms, which is promoted by perestroyka in the USSR.

The interlocutors expressed the common interest in solving difficult problems of world economic ties. Mikhail Gorbachev declared for their international consideration, also with the use of the United Nations Organization. A serious dialogue in regional frameworks, for instance among Latin American countries, on the scope of the Asian-Pacific region, the Non-Aligned Movement, would be very useful.

The acuteness of the question connected with the deepening of the gap in the development of various parts of the world, inequivalent exchange, the growth of debts has surfaced now and threatens with an explosion. It seems everybody is aware of this fact. But the approaches to the quest of solutions are far from being commensurate with the scope of that threat. We are in favour of radical solutions on the road to a new world economic order, but this does not mean that we wish to disrupt the existing historic ties. We are against adventurism. Mikhail Gorbachev suggested that bilateral discussion of world economic problems be put on a regular basis.

Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja conveyed the feelings of respect and friendship to the Soviet leader from Indonesia's President Suharto.

On behalf of the Soviet people and the Soviet leadership Mikhail Gorbachev asked Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja to convey good wishes to the president of Indonesia and wish the Indonesian people success and prosperity on its chosen road.

Eduard Shevardnadze took part in the conversation.

Speaks with Shevardnadze

LD052031 Moscow TASS in English 2004 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 5 TASS—Talks between member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Foreign Minister of the Republic of Indonesia Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja started in Moscow today. Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja is on an official visit in the Soviet Union.

He expressed much satisfaction with the warm welcome accorded him in the Soviet Union, particularly with a meeting with General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev.

During the talks, the ministers had a businesslike and constructive exchange of opinions on the state of and prospects for Soviet-Indonesian relations. Their development was noted, and mutual striving for the deepening of a political dialogue, the widening of equal mutually advantageous cooperation in various areas was confirmed.

The ministers declared in favour of the buildup of efforts to impart dynamism to trade and economic ties between the two countries, in favour of a fuller use of considerable potentialities existing in this area.

The participants in the talks thoroughly discussed a wide range of key international problems, concentrating their attention on questions of ensuring peace and international security, of the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

Indonesia's foreign minister was informed of the Soviet leadership's assessment of the results of the Soviet-American summit and prospects for subsequent agreements in the area of disarmament.

The head of the Indonesian Foreign Policy Department spoke highly of the treaty on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles signed by the USSR and the USA and pointed to its importance for creating a more favourable climate for new steps toward nuclear disarmament and settlement of regional conflicts through talks.

The discussion of the situation in the Asia-Pacific region was conducted from the viewpoint of the need to build up the efforts of the Soviet Union and Indonesia on a bilateral basis and interaction with all the states concerned for the purpose of the solution of topical problems of the area and turning it into a zone of durable peace and goodneighbourly cooperation.

In this context, Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja again declared Indonesia's positive attitude to the Soviet initiatives set out in Mikhail Gorbachev's speech in Vladivostok and his answers to the Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA. He welcomed the Soviet Union's ratification of protocols 2 and 3 to the treaty of Rarotonga.

The Soviet side highly assessed Indonesia's activity in the international arena, its growing contribution to the improvement of the political climate in the Asia-Pacific region and the whole world.

The sides confirmed the stand of the two countries in support of the restructuring of international economic relations on an equitable and democratic basis and establishment of a new international economic order.

The sides declared for the need of ensuring stability and predictability of international economic relations, development of broad, mutually-advantageous trade and economic cooperation among all countries, regardless of their social systems.

The exchange of opinions proceeded in a constructive and benevolent atmosphere reflecting the striving of the sides for the widening of areas of accord, of the strengthening of confidence. The talks will be continued.

Shevardnadze Speaks at Mokhtar Dinner

PM080931 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Feb 1988 Second Edition p 4

["Soviet-Indonesian Talks"]

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR minister of foreign affairs, has given a dinner today in honour of Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja, minister of foreign affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, who is currently on an official visit in the Soviet Union.

Welcoming the guest, Eduard Shevardnadze said:

Our current meeting most accurately illustrates the idea expressed by Mikhail Gorbachev about the relations between the Soviet Union and Indonesia. "We prize our relations with Indonesia", the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said. "We hope that the progress, which has manifested itself in our relations recently, will grow." Certainly, it indisputably grows, which is seen from the third meeting with you, Mr. Minister, in the course of less than a year. The conversations in Jakarta, New York and now in Moscow are a reflection of the dynamically developing plot of the new chapter in the history of contacts between our two countries, and it embraces not only the field of bilateral relations.

A week after the signing of the Washington Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, addressing the summit meeting of the ASEAN member countries in Manila, President Suharto spoke highly about the treaty. Determination was expressed to use the opportunity which emerged as a result of concluding the treaty to intensify the efforts for turning Southeast Asia into a region of peace and cooperation free from nuclear weapons.

Our attitude to the idea of a peace zone in Southeast Asia is known to you. We view it in the context of implementation of another great universal idea, which is that of a nuclear-free and non-violent world. The question does not and cannot arise of somebody's exclusive authorship of it. Irrespective of which regional and international structures conceive and implement the ideas of a nuclear-free status of the world, all of us, the peoples inhabiting the earth, appear as its equal co-authors.

The most graphic example of that is the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles concluded between the USSR and the USA. It bears the clear imprint of interactions of the whole world community. There is also the Indonesian "link" in the chain of the efforts made by it.

At this point it gives me pleasure to recall the interview granted by Mikhail Gorbachev to the newspaper MERDEKA, since it was then that the Soviet Union's preparedness was expressed to agree to the scrapping of all of its medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the country too.

In taking this decision, we were guided in a considerable measure also by the wishes of the Asian nations, respecting their will, the contribution made by them to building the fundamentals of a nuclear free world, including the will and contribution of Indonesia, a great state, one of the initiators and founders of the non-aligned movement, which has much weight and authority in world politics.

This step has given a strong impetus to the perception of the initiatives set forth in the well-known Vladivostok speech by the general secretary of our party's Central Committee.

Have they ensured progress in the Asia-Pacific region and in Asia as a whole? We are examining this question at the current talks particularly closely, since neither you nor we can by any means be indifferent to the answer.

It must be said that the picture is a quite contradictory one. On the one hand, there are positive aspects, serious progress in the required direction, on the other—outstanding conflicts, a dangerous level of military confrontation.

Yet our forecast is positive and is based on the conviction that the Vladivostok initiatives are working and will be working.

If the treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is ratified—and we hope that this will happen—access both to American and Soviet missiles of this class to Asia will be closed forever.

If in the effort to understand each other, representatives of the Soviet Union and ASEAN are overcoming not only borders, but also prejudices, and sit down to the negotiating table to outline a generally acceptable "modus vivendi" in that complex region, the hope is alive, it strengthens and turns into confidence that everything, which only yesterday seemed impossible, is possible.

It can be confidently said today that the policy of national reconciliation being implemented in Kampuchea, Afghanistan, Nicaragua and many other countries engulfed in the regional conflicts determines the leading

trend in their settlement. This policy cannot be viewed as solely a domestic matter of some country or other. It is indispensable as an instrument of peace and good-neighborliness also for the contiguous states.

In sharing Indonesia's concern about the Kampuchean problem, we approve of the efforts made by you to settle it. The contacts between Hun Sen and Prince Sihanouk can be evaluated in a different way. Yet it would be an irreparable mistake to deny support to that process of moving from armed confrontation to a political dialogue.

We were among the first to support the Treaty of Rarotonga, and have recently gone even farther by acceeding to it without any reservations.

Our commitment to the concept of general Asian security and cooperation manifests itself in the clear wish to resolve the problems which crop up jointly with the states concerned—both on a bilateral and multilateral basis.

We placed on record with satisfaction the fact that the stands of the Soviet Union and Indonesia are fully concurrent on the central issues of the present—elimination of nuclear weapons, keeping outer space peaceful, and the scrapping of chemical weapons.

The set of Asian-Pacific problems is broad, and all of them are quite closely interwoven. In developing and pursuing a comprehensive approach to them, the Soviet Union hopes for the creative cooperation of the other states of the region in their resolution. Otherwise it would be unrealistic even to determine that subject. Such issues as a reduction in the level of military confrontation, the strengthening of confidence-building measures, guarantees of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and honoring the status of nuclear-free zones remain as topical as before.

When in Jakarta in March last year, we spoke about the foreign military bases in the region. That gloomy "archipelago" is already getting outdated, yet it lives on.

No pronouncement on that score, even a well-argued one, will become a magic invocation, by whose force it would be possible to eliminate the "base syndrome." Yet it is possible and necessary to take care of confidence building measures even now. Access for inspection to military bases is an absolutely real thing, especially in the light of the experience gained after the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. And here, too, we hope for the cooperation of the countries in whose territory the military bases are located.

We are prepared to substantiate this principle in action if other states agree to take similar steps.

The Soviet-Indonesian dialogue has been raised these days to a new high level.

I bear in mind the conversation held between Mikhail Gorbachev and you today.

I bear in mind the forthcoming signing tomorrow of the Soviet-Indonesian protocol on bilateral consultations. This act, in common with the contents of the document itself, signifies a growing measure of confidence, the elevation of the political contacts between our countries to a new stage of development. It signals an intensification of our bilateral relations, whose most important component part are trade and economic ties. We have drawn the conclusion that the potential of bilateral cooperation is great, the prospects are clear, the results are promising. And all this is a source of gratification for us.

Once Aleksandr Hertzen, a great Russian thinker, described the Pacific as the sea of the future. We see in it a scope for future cooperation between all countries of the region, unmarred by the dangers of wars and conflicts. We see the future prosperity of the peoples and countries between which there will be no reefs of distrust and enmity. I am confident that the Soviet Union and Indonesia can work jointly for the sake of that wonderful aim.

Near East & South Asia

Najibullah on Soviet Troop Withdrawal Statement

LD081811 Moscow TASS in English 1755 GMT 8 Feb 88

[Text] Kabul February 8 (TASS)—President Najibullah of Afghanistan stated today that in order to facilitate the speediest and successful conclusion of the talks in Geneva the Governments of the Republic of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union have agreed that in the event the Geneva agreements are signed on March 15 the withdrawal of the limited Soviet contingent will be started on May 15, 1988 and completed within ten months. In this event the Afghan side will regard as acceptable the withdrawal of a substantial part of Soviet troops already at the first stage. If the Geneva agreements are signed before March 15 then the withdrawal will begin earlier as well, the Afghan leader stressed in his televised statement. It should be stressed that the question of the return of the Soviet troops home is directly connected with the ending of interference and the supply of armaments to the anti-government extremist groupings.

We believe that military confrontation will not intensify in our coutnry after the Soviet troops return home, he said further. In our opinion a growth of the military conflict can be prevented if the opponents of the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan, which in the present situation continue to fan up the flames of war, will display a responsible attitude and make a considered contribution to peaceloving activity directed at ensuring

a calm life for their own people. They must know that if they do not follow common sense they will confront the iron will of the Afghan people yearning for peace and tranquility in the country and also contradict the obligations of the state to stop interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

There are now big hopes and possibilities for the forthcoming shortly round of the Geneva talks directed at settling the external aspect of the problem to become fruitful and concluding one, to bring about the speediest signing of documents, the president of Afghanistan said.

If some governments and certain politicians take a stand directed at postponing the signing of the Geneva agreements under any pretext, Najibullah said, this will be added proof of their desire to preserve tension in the region and discredit the mission of the United Nations secretary general and his personal envoy and in the long run to nullify the process of the Geneva talks. In this event the entire responsibility for the consequences will rest with those whose actions will deadlock the process of the Geneva talks. We hope, however, that this will not happen, he said.

The president of Afghanistan also stressed that the conclusion of the talks in Geneva and the withdrawal of Soviet troops should not be linked with the conclusion of efforts to create a coalition government in Afghanistan. National reconciliation and the creation of such a government are a purely internal Afghan matter which should be settled by the Afghans themselves.

Afghan Army 'Successful' in Herat, Qandahar

LD061126 Moscow TASS in English 1109 GMT 6 Feb 88

[Text] Kabul February 6 TASS—Afghan Army units have carried out successful operations on routing extremists in the provinces of Herat and Qandahar.

The actions were undertaken to meet the demands of the local population and national reconciliation commissions in connection with the threat to the life and property of civilians.

Earlier on, in keeping with terms of the ceasefire agreement, representatives of the Afghan Command suggested that the terrorists lay down arms. They refused.

A gang of bandits and their leader were captured in Zendajan district, Herat province. Two terrorist leaders were killed in fighting in Qandahar.

In Parwan, members of an anti-government formation responded to the commission's appeal and laid down arms.

Arms Convoy Seized at Afghan-Pakistani Border

LD070708 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0633 GMT 7 Feb 88

[Text] Kabul: 7 Feb (TASS)—The security forces have captured a convoy carrying weapons and ammunition across the Afghan-Paksitani border in Nangarhar Province. Seized from the extremists was a large quantity of missiles which were to be used for shelling housing estates, explosives and explosive devices, as well as rounds for light and heavy small arms.

East Europe

PZPR Politburo Discusses Price Reforms

PM051230 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Feb 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Measures Were Necessary"]

[Text] Warsaw, 4 Feb—Decisions adopted recently in the sphere of prices and incomes, although difficult and burdensome for the population, were, however, necessary, the report on the routine PZPR Central Committee Politburo session, held here on Wednesday, says. These measures should be seen as closely linked to the change in the rules for the functioning of the economy, a change in the direction of freeing economic initiative and enterprise. They create the conditions for increasing efficiency and for enterprises to adopt rational economic decisions.

The Politburo shares the government's view that price rises are not the only, or the most important, element in the restoration of the balance between market and incomes. On the contrary, all the efforts of enterprises, which are being provided with a more rational mechanism in the form of objective prices, should be aimed at increasing the supply of products and services. This is the way to solve the country's main economic problems.

The decisions within the framework of the reform, the Politburo stressed, are oriented toward the priority goal—the working people's well-being.

Public Reaction to Increases

LD062254 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer Yuriy Rostov] A more effective economic mechanism is currently being developed in many socialist countries. This process is also under way in Poland. A reform was recently announced in the country: There have been price increases, increases in the prices of raw material, gas, and agricultural produce. At the same time, pensions and additional wage payments have been increased. We have our correspondent in Warsaw, Vladimir Beletskiy, here. What has been the reaction in Poland to this complicated reform?

[Beletskiy] Well, all over the world that sort of news is greeted with no particular rejoicing. Poland is no exception in that respect. As the local press points out, it was a difficult but inevitable decision. It reflected the results of the referendum, which showed that the public supports the reform but fears a decline in the standard of living as a result of implementing it at an accelerated rate. Suggestions from trade unions and other social organizations were also taken into account.

This was the first reaction by Warsaw women.

[Video shows Warsaw TV clip of women being interviewed in street] [Unidentified woman in Polish, fading into superimposed Russian translation] There would seem to have been no other way out of the situation. It is hard for me to get by on one salary, with my three children. It will not be easy. I will not be able to leave anything unaccounted for.

[Beletskiy] As is known, the state has taken measures to maintain the population's standard of living and considerably compensate for the price increases. As of 1 February, for example, monthly wage supplements amounting to Z6,000 are being paid at state enterprises and institutions; depending on the success of the enterprise, these supplements can be bigger. Pensions and stipends have gone up, as have various subsidies, especially to individuals and families on low incomes. Procurement prices for agricultural produce have also been increased.

Attempts by certain Western radio stations to inflame the situation and destroy calm in the country have met with failure. Before the prices went up as planned, there was of course a certain buying fever in the shops. But now everything is back to normal. Labor enterprise collectives and all of society have manifested civic maturity and understanding for the difficult decisions in this matter.

First Ombudsman Examines 'Injustices' in Poland

PM051611 Moscow TRUD in Russian 29 Jan 88 p 3

[Own Correspondent Yu. Skvortsov report: "An Ombudsman Called Ewa"]

[Text] Warsaw, Jan—Ewa Letowska is the most famous woman in Poland today. She has been elected by the Sejm as the first civil rights ombudsman in Poland's history.

Just what is a civil rights ombudsman? Someone who defends civil rights. Someone to whom every Pole can turn if he feels that a government organ, an organization, or an institution has treated him unfairly, contrary to the law or contrary to the country's constitution. Or, conversely, if the letter of the law has been formally observed but in fact an injustice has been committed.

It goes without saying that in such instances a person can go to court and can appeal against a court's decision to the organs which monitor legal proceedings. In the opinion of the leaders of the Patriotic Movement for National Rebirth [PRON], however, Poland should also have a supreme protector of citizens' rights and freedoms. An arbiter subordinate to no one in the country except the supreme organ of power—the Sejm. This PRON initiative was supported by the 10th PZPR Congress. So it was that at the beginning of 1988 Ewa Letowska—the ombudsman for civil rights—began work which will last at least 4 years, until the next elections.

Ewa has quite a few assistants: 22 specialist lawyers and 12 technical staff. On her first workday Letowska received more than 200 letters and more than 20 people came in person to tell her their problems.

The ombudsman does not investigate anonymous letters. Not all the callers have come to the right person. However, in 70 percent of cases Ewa Letowska's intervention has indeed been required.

Letowska believes that giving people help in specific situations is not the extent of the ombudsman's function. If she is convinced there are breaches of a law or conflicts between the individual and the organs of power which are going to occur regularly because the law has overlooked an important sphere of life she will suggest to the Sejm that it amend the law or adopt a new law.

The 1st week of the ombudsman's work is long enough for meaningful conclusions to be drawn. At a meeting with journalists Ewa Letowska reported only that the number of letters she has received is growing daily. Most complaints focus on what the writers believe are mistakes by the legal authorities or injustices in the award of pensions and the allocation of housing.

Thus Ewa Letowska is the most popular woman in Poland today. But the secret of her sudden popularity is not simply her new and very complex post nor the fact that the defender of rights and civil liberties is a woman. Letowska fully meets the demands made on a person in such a post. Her professional competence is vast: Letowska is a doctor of law, a civil law specialist, and author of 60 academic works and 3 books. She is a public figure—she is a member of the Council of Ministers' Legislative Council. She has a sophisticated and subtle intellect. Letowska and her husband are interested in classical music and even used to host a classical music program on the radio. Answering a question from journalists about the moral qualities required by an ombudsman, Ewa Letowska placed honesty first.

Ceausescu Discusses 1987 Plan Fulfillment

PM081139 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Feb 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Council Session"]

[Text] Bucharest, 6 Feb—A plenum of the Romanian National Council of Working People has completed its work here. Its participants discussed the work of working

people's councils and the results of the 1987 plan fulfillment. The plenum examined and approved a plan for the country's socioeconomic development in the current year.

The plenum was addressed by N. Ceausescu, RCP general secretary and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania. He noted that good results were achieved in 1987 in the country's socioeconomic development. National income rose. Industrial production increased by 4.5 percent, and agricultural production increased by 2.3 percent. At the same time he pointed out a number of shortcomings and defined ways of overcoming them.

Ceausescu Thanks CPSU, Presidium for Greetings
PM081225 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Feb 88 Second Edition p 1

[Cable sent by N. Ceausescu to CPSU Central Committee and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium]

[Text] To the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Dear Comrades,

Please accept my ardent gratitude for your congratulations and wishes on my 70th birthday.

I express firm confidence that thanks to our joint actions in the spirit of the accords reached at summit level, the Romanian-Soviet relations of friendship and all-around cooperation will continue to develop for the benefit and in the interests of our countries' peoples and the cause of peace and socialism.

I wish you, the Communists, and all the Soviet working people great new successes in the implementation of the program outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress in the struggle for the triumph of peace and coperation throughout the world.

Nicolae Ceausescu, RCP general secretary and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

Nikonov, Medvedev Attend Romanian Jubilee
PM081235 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Important Anniversary"]

[Text] The Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance signed by the Soviet Union and Romania in 1948 laid firm foundations for qualitatively new Soviet-Romanian relations—relations of total equality, mutual respect, comradely solidarity, and all-round cooperation. A ceremonial meeting of representatives of the capital's working people dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the signing of this document was held in the Hall of Columns in the House of the Unions on 3 February.

The presidium included V.P. Nikonov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary; V.A. Medvedev, CPSU Central Committee secretary; V.P. Orlov, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium deputy chairman; A.K. Antonov, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman; the leaders of a number of ministries and departments; and representatives of party, soviet, and social organizations. A delegation of the Romanian Institute of Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries and the Romanian-Soviet Friendship Society led by M. Subtirelu, Romanian deputy minister of domestic trade, was also present.

The speaker—Soviet minister S.G. Shcherbakov, chairman of the Soviet-Romanian Friendship Society Central Board—noted that this document, born in the first years of the world socialist system, has become one of the links in a new type of international relations. The ideas and principles incorporated in it have opened up broad opportunities to strengthen the union between the two states and their friendly relations on a bilateral basis and within the framework of the Warsaw Pact and CEMA. The consolidation of our achievements and the deepening of collaboration between the CPSU and the RCP and between the USSR and Romania in the spirit of our time will benefit from the accords reached last year during the meetings between our parties' and countries' leaders. Joint efforts by the Soviet Union and Romania, and also by other socialist countries, in the struggle to build a nuclear- and violence-free world are particularly important in the present international situation.

Our country, I. Bucur, Romanian ambassador to the Soviet Union, said, believes the main problem of our age is to end the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, move toward real disarmament measures, and eliminate the threat of a thermonuclear catastrophe. Romania, he stressed, welcomed the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles with satisfaction and regards it as an event of worldwide historic importance and the result of realistic thinking. Dwelling on the question of deepening ties between the two countries, the ambassador emphasized their importance—the Long-Term Program to Develop Economic and Scientific and Technical Cooperation between Romania and the Soviet Union in the period through 2000 has great significance in this respect. Its implementation will give a powerful boost to trade growth, production cooperation and specialization, and cooperation in the construction of important national economic projects in both countries.

Dobrynin Receives Bulgaria's Lukanov
LD032328 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 3 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] Comrade Dobrynin today met with Comrade Lukanov, BCP Central Committee Politburo candidate member and minister of foreign economic relations of

the People's Republic of Bulgaria. They exchanged opinions on certain questions of international cooperation. Bulgarian Ambassador to the USSR Pankov took part in the conversation.

LCY Weekly Analyzes Kosovo's 'Backwardness'

PM051659 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Sharov report under rubric "From the Socialist Countries": "KOMUNIST: How To Boost Kosovo"]

[Text] Belgrade, 28 Jan—Despite economic and cultural successes, the Autonomous Province of Kosovo is still lagging behind other regions of the country in terms of its development. The weekly KOMUNIST, an organ of the LCY, has quoted some figures in this connection. Kosovo has the lowest labor productivity and the highest level of unemployment. In 1987 industrial output fell by 8.2 percent (a record for Yugoslavia). Economic losses increased. As a result of this the accounts of some 200 enterprises had to be frozen.

Analyzing the reasons for the province's economic backwardness, the weekly concludes that its ill-judged development policy and economic and other forms of isolation have done a great deal of damage.

Considerable resources are being invested in Kosovo's economy, KOMUNIST continues, particularly from the national aid fund for poorly developed regions. In the past these resources have mainly been used to build heavy industry enterprises which have provided few jobs and failed to secure planned exports of output. Furthermore, they have taken a long time to build and their products are not in demand. At the end of last December 1 year's output of electric motors and motor vehicle chassis, 6 months' output of ferronickel, and so forth had accumulated in warehouses. Stocks of unsold goods "eat up" more than half of all circulating capital.

The weekly points out that there is real potential to make decisive improvements in the province's economy. The LCY Central Committee reached this conclusion at its ninth plenum. It has adopted principled decisions concerning the province's development. The main task now, KOMUNIST writes, is to consistently and persistently implement these decisions. The first steps have been taken in this direction. A national Kosovo aid program was approved at the end of 1987. Important projects are being built here through the republics' joint efforts. It goes without saying that internal reserves must be mobilized and discipline and organization in the province improved.

West Europe

FRG'S Spaeth Pays Official Visit to Soviet Union

Interviewed Before Visit

PM081253 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Feb 88 First Edition p 5

[TASS correspondents G. Kulbitskiy and V. Serov dispatch specially for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA: "Opening a New Page in USSR-FRG Relations. Interview With Lothar Spaeth, Prime Minister of Baden-Wuerttemberg Land"]

[Text] Stuttgart—The new page in Soviet-FRG relations for which M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has called, must be filled with specific content. Therein lies the main goal of our visit to the Soviet Union, Lothar Spaeth, prime minister of West Germany's Baden-Wuerttemberg Land, told TASS correspondents in an interview specially for our newspaper. He pays an official visit to our country on 7 February.

During the forthcoming talks in Moscow, L. Spaeth said, we intend to discuss major political questions, including disarmament problems. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed in Washington is the first-ever major agreement that stipulates genuine disarmament. It is particularly important for Europe since the nuclear weapons to be destroyed are sited on European territory and are targeted on Europe. Some two-thirds of all the Pershings deployed in the FRG are sited in Baden-Wuerttemberg. That is why we must insist, first, on the speediest ratification of this treaty, and, second, on the continuation of the disarmament process. In particular, we are interested in reaching agreement on 50% cuts in strategic offensive weapons, achieving stability in the sphere of conventional arms, and examining the question of tactical nuclear weapons. This also concerns the universal and complete prohibition of chemical weapons, where the positions of the FRG and the USSR largely coincide.

Apart from the discussion of political questions, L. Spaeth continued, the main aim of my visit to your country lies in studying the potential for further developing economic cooperation between Baden-Wuerttemberg and the Soviet Union. Our land cooperates very intensively with the USSR in many spheres. Not for nothing were the first four joint Soviet-West German enterprises built with the participation of firms from Baden-Wuerttemberg. These were the shoe firm Salamander, the machine building firm Liebher, the machine tool building firm Heinemann, and the publishing and printing firm Burda.

Answering a question about how he assesses the large-scale transformations taking place in the USSR and the possibilities they open up for the intensification of Soviet-West German economic cooperation, the prime

minister said: We welcome these processes and are prepared to make a contribution to accelerating the pace of economic restructuring, which should lead to an improvement in the Soviet people's prosperity. Our contribution may, in particular, take the form of cooperation in training cadres for industry at various levels, from vocational and technical education through the training of managers.

The other important areas of our collaboration to be discussed in Moscow, L. Spaeth continued, will be environmental protection, nuclear power, and medicine. It is in these spheres that Baden-Wuerttemberg has considerable potential. A major nuclear research center and the European Environmental Protection Center are based in Karlsruhe, for instance.

Bearing in mind the specific features of Baden-Wuerttemberg, where there is a significant proportion of medium-sized and smaller enterprises with advanced technology, the prime minister noted, one could examine the possibility of locating a number of joint enterprises in one economic region of the USSR. This would facilitate the coordination of their activities.

Touching on the prospects for cooperation between the FRG, particularly Baden-Wuerttemberg, and the Soviet Union in the peaceful exploration of space, L. Spaeth pointed to the need to find new ways and forms of cooperating. Answering a question on whether he believes it possible for a West German cosmonaut to participate in a joint flight aboard a Soviet orbiting station—as a French cosmonaut did previously—he said: "I can quite easily imagine it."

Arrives in Moscow

LD072024 Hamburg DPA in German 1905 GMT 7 Feb 88

[Excerpt] Moscow (DPA)—The prime minister of Baden-Wuerttemberg, Lothar Spaeth, arrived this evening in Moscow for a 5-day visit. Spaeth, who is accompanied by leading representatives of the economy, was met by the prime minister of the Russian Union Republic, the Politburo member, Vitaliy Vorotnikov, who invited Spaeth.

Toward midday tomorrow, Spaeth will meet with Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardandze. A meeting with the Kremlin chief, Mikhail Gorbachev, is scheduled for Tuesday morning. [passage omitted]

Vorotnikov 'Taken Ill'

LD080905 Hamburg DPA in German 0707 GMT 8 Feb 88

[Excerpts] Moscow (DPA)—Baden-Wuerttembuerg Prime Minister Lothar Spaeth (CDU), has warned against attaching too much value to the Cocom list at the start of his 5-day stay in the Soviet Union. However, from the other side, a "little list with clear regulations" was necessary, Spaeth said on Sunday evening to journalists in Moscow. The Cocom list lays down goods, including those for military use, which may not be exported into the Eastern bloc.

Spaeth, who had conferred with Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl at the weekend, basically said that East-West relations should not merely be viewed from security aspects but rather cooperation in economic and social spheres also had to be concretized. Spaeth is accompanied by a 55-person delegation with top-ranking representatives of the economic, cultural, and scientific worlds. [passage omitted]

Spaeth's host, Vitaliy Vorotnikov, prime minister of the Russian Union Republic, was taken ill unexpectedly. Thus on Monday morning, Spaeth will be meeting his deputy, Fikryat Tabeyev.

Holds Talks With Tabeyev

LD081206 Moscow TASS in English 1154 GMT 8 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 8 TASS—A meeting with R. Lothar Spaeth, minister-president of Baden-Wuerttemberg (FRG), was held at the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation today. Dr. Lothar Spaeth came to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation.

A useful exchange of opinions was held on a number of questions of the present-day international situation, the Soviet-West German relations. It was noted with satisfaction that the positive changes that have recently taken place in the international atmosphere, create good prerequisites for consolidating peace and security, broad cooperation between countries.

Fikryat Tabeyev, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, has said that the expansion of many-sided relations between the USSR and the FRG, which meet the interests of both peoples, makes for a climate of greater confidence in the relations between states. A major positive role that intensive contacts in economy, science, culture between the Russian Federation and West German lands might play was noted. The two sides discussed concrete ways of further development of business cooperation between organizations of the Russian Federation and Baden-Wuerttemberg firms. The two sides came to the common opinion that the minister-president's visit would give a fresh impetus to the quest for new forms and directions of stepping up and perfecting relations between the USSR and the FRG.

Dr. Lothar Spaeth's attention was drawn to perestroyka which is under way in the USSR. The Soviet Union entered a new crucial stage of practical actions in furthering the program of renovation of the life of the

Soviet people. The radical transformations in society create a fruitful ground for consolidating businesslike, many-sided cooperation between the USSR and the FRG.

Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation Vasiliy Kazakov, Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation Vladimir Vinogradov took part in the talk which passed in a friendly atmosphere. The FRG ambassador to the USSR Andreas Meyer-Landrut was present at the meeting.

The guest laid a wreath to the Unknown Soldier's Tomb at the Kremlin Wall.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Delivers Statement on Afghanistan

LD081805 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 8 Feb 88

[Statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; read by announcer on 8 February]

The military conflict in Afghanistan has been going on for a long time now. It is one of the most bitter and painful regional conflicts. Judging by everything, certain prerequisites have now emerged for its political settlement. In this context, the Soviet leadership considers it necessary to set forth its views and to make its position totally clear.

In the near future, a new round of talks conducted by Afghanistan and Pakistan through the personal representative of the United Nations secretary general will be held in Geneva. There is a considerable possibility that this round will become a final one.

By now, documents covering all aspects of a settlement have been almost fully worked out at the Geneva negotiations. They include agreements between Afghanistan and Pakistan on non-interference in each other's internal affairs and on the return of Afghan refugees from Pakistan; international guarantees of non-interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs; a document on the interrelationship of all elements of a political settlement. There is also agreement on establishing a verification mechanism.

So what remains to be done? To establish a time frame for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan that would be acceptable to all. Precisely that— a time frame, since the fundamental political decision to withdraw Soviet troops from Afghanistan was adopted by us, in agreement with the Afghan leadership, some time ago, and announced at that same time. The question of a time frame has both a technical and a political aspect. As for the technical aspect, it is clear that the actual withdrawal of troops will take a certain amount of time. There is hardly any need to go into the details of that here.

As for the political aspect of the matter, it is that the withdrawal of Soviet troops is, quite naturally, linked with precluding interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs. Prerequisites for solving this question have now been created.

Seeking to facilitate a speedy and successful conclusion of the Geneva talks between Afghanistan and Pakistan, the governments of the USSR and the Republic of Afghanistan have agreed to set a specific date for beginning the withdrawal of Soviet troops—May 15, 1988—and to complete their withdrawal within 10 months. The date is set based upon the assumption that agreements on the settlement would be signed no later than March 15, 1988 and that, accordingly, they would all enter into force simultaneously two months after that. If the agreements are signed before March 15, the withdrawal of troops will, accordingly, begin earlier.

Recently, another question has been raised as to whether the phasing of Soviet troop withdrawal could be arranged in such a way as to withdraw, already during the first phase, a relatively greater portion of the Soviet contingent. Well, that too could be done. The Afghan leadership and we agree to it.

All of this creates the necessary conditions for signing the settlement agreement in the very near future.

That, of course, does not mean that no one could now obstruct the settlement or push the talks backwards. But we would not like to think that some states or political figures might want to be held accountable by the Afghan nation and other nations for scuttling a settlement. We believe that common sense will prevail.

The question of the withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan was raised at the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

That was a reflection of our current political thinking, of our new, modern view of the world. We wanted thereby to reaffirm our commitment to the tradition of good-neighborliness, good will, and mutual respect, which go back to Vladimir Lenin and the first Soviet-Afghan treaty signed in 1921. The progressive forces of Afghan society have understood and accepted our sincere desire for peace and tranquility between our two neighboring countries, which for several decades were an example of peaceful coexistence and mutually-beneficial equitable cooperation.

Any armed conflict, including an internal one, can poison the atmosphere in an entire region and create a situation of anxiety and alarm for a country's neighbors, to say nothing of the suffering and losses among its own people. That is why we are against any armed conflicts. We know that the Afghan leadership, too, takes the same attitude.

It is well known that all of that has caused the Afghan leadership, headed by President Najibullah, to undertake a profound rethinking of political course, which has crystallized in the patriotic and realistic policy of national reconciliation. It was an act of great courage and bravery; not merely an appeal to cease armed clashes, but a proposal to set up a coalition government and share power with the opposition, including those who wage armed struggle against the government and even those who, while abroad, direct the rebels' operations and supply them with weapons and combat equipment obtained from foreign countries. And that proposal was made by a government vested with constitutional authority and wielding real power in the country.

The policy of national reconciliation is a reflection of new political thinking on the Afghan side. It is not a sign of weakness, but rather of the force of spirit, wisdom and dignity of the free, honest and responsible political leaders concerned about their country's present and future.

Success of the policy of national reconciliation has already made it possible to begin withdrawing Soviet troops from portions of Afghan territory. At present, there are no Soviet troops in 13 Afghan provinces—because armed clashes have ceased there. It can well be said that the more rapidly the pace of establishing peace on Afghan soil, the easier it will be for Soviet troops to leave.

The policy of national reconciliation has provided a political platform for all those who want peace in Afghanistan. What kind of peace? The kind that the Afghan people will choose. The proud, freedom-loving, and courageous Afghan people, which has gone through many centuries of struggle for freedom and independence, has been, is, and will continue to be the master of its own country, which, as President Najibullah has said, is built on a tradition of multi-party politics and of a multiple-structural economy.

The Afghans themselves will decide the final status of their country among other nations. It is most often being said that the future peaceful Afghanistan will be an independent, non-aligned, and neutral state. Well, we would only be happy to have such a neighbor on our southern borders.

In connection with the question of beginning the withdrawal of Soviet troops, there is a need to make clear our position on yet another aspect—whether the withdrawal is linked with the completion of efforts to set up a new, coalition government in Afghanistan, i.e. with bringing the policy of national reconciliation to fruition. We are convinced it is not.

The withdrawal of Soviet troops, combined with other aspects of the settlement, including guarantees of non-interference, is one thing. Various states are involved in it. Speaking of this, we believe Iran, a neighboring country, should not stand aside from political settlement.

National reconciliation and the establishment of a coalition government is another thing. This is a purely internal Afghan issue. It can only be resolved by the Afghans themselves, though they belong to different and even opposing camps. When, however, it is hinted to us that the Soviet Union should take part in talks on that issue, and even talk to third countries, our answer is firm and clear: Don't expect us to do it; it is none of our business. Or yours, for that matter.

But could hostilities flare up even more after Soviet troops leave? It would hardly be appropriate to prophesy, but I think such a course of events could be prevented if those now fighting against their brothers take a responsible attitude and try indeed to get involved in peace-building. If, however, they are guided not by the arguments of reason, but by emotions, multiplied by fanaticism, then they would be confronted with the greatly increased will of the Afghan people to see their country pacified and with the obligations of states to no longer interfere in its internal affairs. The Geneva obligations will close the channels for outside assistance to those who hope to impose their will on the whole nation by armed force.

If necessary, consideration could be given at that stage to using the possibilities available to the United Nations and its Security Council.

Now, about our boys, our soldiers in Afghanistan. They have been and are doing their duty honestly, performing acts of self-denial and heroism.

Our people profoundly respect those who were called to serve in Afghanistan. The state provides for them—as a matter of priority—good educational opportunities and a chance to get interesting, worthy work.

The memory of those who have died a hero's death in Afghanistan is sacred to us. It is the duty of party and Soviet authorities to make sure their families and relatives are taken care of with concern, attention and kindness.

Finally, when the Afghan knot is untied, it will have the most profound impact on other regional conflicts too.

Whereas the arms race, which we are working so hard—and with some success—to stop, is mankind's mad race to the abyss, regional conflicts are bleeding wounds which can result in gangrenous growth on the body of mankind.

The earth is literally spotted with such wounds. Each of them means pain, not only for the nations directly involved but for all—whether in Afghanistan, in the Middle East, in Kampuchea, or in Central America.

Who gains from those conflicts? No one except the arms merchants and various reactionary expansionist circles who are used to exploiting and turning a profit on people's misfortunes and tragedies.

Implementing political settlement in Afghanistan will be an important rupture in the chain of regional conflicts.

Just as the agreement to eliminate intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is to be followed by a series of further major steps toward disarmament, with negotiations on them already underway or being planned, likewise behind the political settlement in Afghanistan already looms a question: Which conflict will be settled next? It is certain that more is to follow.

States and nations have sufficient reserves of responsibility, political will and determination to put an end to all regional conflicts within a few years. This is worth working for. The Soviet Union will spare no effort in this most important cause.

Maslyukov Named Gosplan Chief, Talyzin Relieved
LD061806 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1752 GMT 6 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow 6 Feb (TASS)—By decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, Nikolay Talyzin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Minister has been relieved of his duties as chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee.

Yuriy Maslyukov has been appointed first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The USSR Council of Ministers has confirmed Nikolay Talyzin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, as chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Social Development.

Maslyukov Biography
LD061835 Moscow TASS in English 1815 GMT 6 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 6 TASS—Yuriy Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, was born in the city of Leninabad, Tajikistan (a Soviet Central Asian republic) in 1937. He is Russian. A member of the CPSU since 1966, he received higher education at the Leningrad Mechanical Institute.

Yuriy Maslyukov started working in 1962 as engineer at the Scientific and Research Technological Institute, then as senior engineer, deputy chief of a department, chief engineer and deputy director for scientific work of the institute. In 1970-1974 he worked as chief engineer at a machine-building factory and since 1974 in the ministry: First, as head of a department, member of the collegium, then as a deputy minister. In 1982-1985 he is first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, since November 1985 deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Yuriy Maslyukov is a deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet and member of the CPSU Central Committee.

Politburo Commission Repeals Bukharin Conviction
LD051810 Moscow TASS in English 1802 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 5 TASS—The following communique was published here under the title "At the Commission of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee for Additional Study of Material Connected with Repression Which Took Place in the'30s-'40s and the Early'50s":

The commission at its meeting on February 5, 1988, heard information by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court on the results of considering a protest filed by the general procurator of the USSR in the case of N.I. Bukharin, A.I. Rykov, A.P. Rozengolts, M.A. Chernov, P.P. Bulanov, L.G. Levin, I.N. Kazakov, V.A. Maksimov-Dikovskiy, P.P. Kryuchkov and Kh.G Rakovskiy, who were brought to criminal responsibility for being allegedly part of the so-called "anti-Soviet right-wing Trotskyite bloc".

Those people were convicted by the Military Collegium of the USSR Supreme Court in March 1938 on charges of having organized a conspriatorial group, on an assignment from the intelligence services of foreign states hostile to the USSR, with the aim of overthrowing the socialist, social and state system existing in the USSR and having engaged in wrecking-sabotage, terrorist or other hostile activities.

As has been established, the pre-trial investigation of the case was conducted with gross violations of socialist legality, with facts being falsified and the admissions of guilt wrung from the accused through unlawful methods.

Note was taken of the announcement by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court that the Supreme Court's plenary meeting on February 4, 1988, passed a ruling repealing the Military Collegium's verdict with regard to the convicts N.I.Bukharin, A.I. Rykov, A.P. Rozengolts, M.A. Chernov, P.P. Bulanov, L.G. Levin, I.N. Kazakov, V.A.Maksimov-Dikovskiy, P.P. Kryuchkov and Kh.G. Rakovskiy and dismissed the case for the absence of crime in their actions.

Earlier the USSR Supreme Court fully rehabilitated for the same reason N.N. Krestinskiy, G.F. Grinko, I.A. Zelenskiy, V.I. Ivanov, S.A. Bessonov, A. Ikramov, F. Khodzhayev, V.F. Sharangovich, P.T. Zubarev and D.D. Pletnev, who were tried in the same case.

The Procurator's Office of the USSR did not lodge a protest concerning G.G. Yagoda who was tried in the same case as well.

The commission of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee is continuing its work.

Gerasimov Reads Report

LD052216 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Announcer] We have just received a tape recording from the press center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, where a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists is under way. Comrade Gerasimov, head of the information department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in addressing the briefing, said:

[Begin Gerasimov recording] A session of the commission of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on further study of the materials pertaining to the repressions that took place in the period of the 1930's and 1940's and the start of the 1950's was held today.

The commission heard information from the USSR Supreme Court chairman on the results of the review of the appeal of the USSR procurator general on the case of Bukharin, Rykov, Rozengolts, Chernov, Bulanov, Levin, Kazakov, Maksimov-Dikovskiy, Kryuchkov and Rakovskiy. They were held criminally liable over the so-called anti-Soviet rightist Trotskiyist bloc.

They were convicted by a military collegium of the USSR Supreme Court in March 1938, accused of working for intelligence services of foreign states hostile to the USSR, organizing a conspiratorial group with the aim of overthrowing the existing socialist social and state system in the USSR, and of carrying out acts of sabotage, wrecking, terrorist and other hostile acts.

It has been established that the preliminary investigations on this case were carried out with gross violations of socialist legality; it was falsified, and testimonies of confession were obtained from the accused by impermissible methods.

The report of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court has been taken into account. It states that a plenum of the Supreme Court, in its decree of 4 February 1988, cancelled the verdict of the military collegium with regard to the condemned: Bukharin, Rykov, Rozengolts, Chernov, Bulanov, Levin, Kazakov, Maksimov-Dikovskiy, Kryuchkov, and Rakovskiy, and dismissed the case due to the absence of a formal element of the definition of a crime in their actions.

Earlier, Krestinskiy, Grinko, Selenskiy, Ivanov, Bessonov, Ikramov, Khodzhayev, Sharangovich, Zubarev, and Pletnev were fully rehabilitated by the Supreme Court on the same case and for the same reasons.

The appeal on behalf of Yagoda for the same case, was not lodged by the Procuracy of the USSR.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo Commission is continuing its work. [end recording]

[Announcer] That was an address by Comrade Gerasimov, head of the information directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists in the press center of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

IZVESTIYA Interviews Court Member

PM081447 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 3

[N. Bodnaruk article including interview with M.A. Marov,member of the USSR Supreme Court: "Win for Justice. How the 4 February USSR Supreme Court Plenum Was Prepared and Held"]

[Text] "The truth will out.... Justice will triumph...." We often say these or similar words. For lofty and commonplace, historic and purely everyday reasons. We say them when we are firmly convinced of this and when we merely hope and want to believe that this will happen. We were not the inventors of these words, we were not the first to believe in the immutability of this law of life. It has been confirmed over the centuries. For not a century has elapsed—in the history of our country or other countries—without great and small injustices. And there has not been a generation which has not been convinced: Justice triumphs sooner or later! However skillfully the truth has been hidden and however people may have prospered by deceiving their contemporaries, a new generation will come and put everything in its place.

These thoughts came back to me every time I was in the hall where the USSR Supreme Court Plenum was held and I heard the words: "I vote to grant the USSR prosecutor general's protest...." For these exact words mark the demand for the restoration of justice in the case in question.

Every day recedes into history. But not every day is destined to go down in history. This day has receded into history and has gone down in history. Readers already know from the CPSU Central Committee Politburo Commission's report that on 4 February 1988 a USSR Supreme Court Plenum, after examining a protest from the USSR prosecutor general, adopted a resolution rescinding the verdict against people condemned in 1938 as members of the so-called "anti-Soviet Rightist-Trotskyist bloc."

Outwardly everything happened in a commonplace impartial fashion and only the silence betrayed the intensity with which the members of the court were listening to every word. The speaker M. Marov, member of the USSR Supreme Court, was on the rostrum. The precise formulas of the case as they went down into history 50 years ago followed. Surnames.... Biographical data.... Investigation materials.... The charges and articles of the law.... The court's verdict.... The true facts testifying to the innocence of the convicted defendants

were adduced in the same order, with seemingly unnecessary meticulousness. In this way the lies were destroyed word by word before our eyes. The criminal group called in the verdict the anti-Soviet rightist-Trotskyist bloc did not exist, there was no espionage for Japanese or German intelligence services, there was no sabotage, wrecking, or terrorist and other hostile activity....

They were innocent!

N.I. Bukharin, A.I. Rykov, A.P. Rozengolts, M.A. Chernov, P.P. Bulanov, L.G. Levin, I.N. Kazakov, V.A. Maksimov-Dikovskiy, P.P. Kryuchkov, and Kh.G. Rakovskiy. We are, as it were, renewing our acquaintance with certain names well known from textbooks and hearing others for the first time. Apart from their names we will have to find out about their characters and their fate, understand what governed their lives, and understand where they were right and where they were mistaken. The main thing now is that justice is being done.

USSR Prosecutor General A. Rekunkov adduced his arguments and assessments and USSR Supreme Court Members I. Alkhazov, R. Brize, R. Tikhomirnov, and A. Yakimenko spoke. There was no dispute or disagreement in the assessments. USSR Supreme Court Chairman V. Terebilov put the prosecutor general's appeal to the vote. The decision was unanimous: "Case dismissed as lacking corpus delicti [sostav prestupleniya]."

The hall of sessions emptied. I was not able to hear what the members of the Supreme Court said to each other during those minutes, still less what they were thinking. We sat down with Mikhail Alekseyevich Marov, who delivered the report on the case, and I was the first to be able to ask him questions "from the floor":

[Bodnaruk] Mikhail Alekseyevich, my questions may not be the most important and the most precise ones—the hearing of this case has prompted too many thoughts. But readers need information now. Today you participated in and I witnessed what is in my opinion a historic event. Or am I exaggerating?

[Marov] I am sure you are not. For the point is not only that justice has been restored with regard to people who are part of history. In itself this act will go down in history as a case of the triumph of justice, a sign of our times, and a touchstone for our aspirations for the future. The party has proclaimed justice as the norm of our life and consistently affirms it in matters large and small. As we have witnessed once again.

[Bodnaruk] You must have been aware of the extent of your responsibility both to the past and to your contemporaries when you began studying this case....

[Marov] Yes, of course. You know, even when you are examining the question of rehabilitating an unknown man whom no one apart from his relatives has heard of, you realize that you hold destiny in your hands, that the greater truth is made up of a multitude of small truths, and the same applies when it is a question of people involved in historic events.

[Bodnaruk] But surely the injustice of the case under review was obvious from the very beginning? It was not for nothing that the following words were said at the plenum (I quote from my notebook): "I don't envy the people who are to prepare the court resolution, there was no proof of guilt, so there was nothing to disprove.... The whole thing was fiction...."

[Marov] Don't forget that this was said after Supreme Court workers were given the results of a thorough case study. To think that there was nothing to investigate is a delusion, and a far from harmless one at that. We do not have the right to rewrite history several times—even trifling details. Therefore in each specific case we must be sure that whoever comes after us, no matter how carpingly they study the investigation and court materials—no one will ever reach conclusions which contradict ours. Of course, we presumed, and we saw confirmation in other cases, that N. Bukharin and the others convicted with him in the same case did not commit criminal actions. But it is one thing to have a feeling and make conjectures and suppositions and quite another to prove and establish the truth with the force of law.

[Bodnaruk] Another problem also arises here which concerns us writers. I understand those who want to restore the truth about our recent past as soon as possible. I have no doubt that they have good motives. But we must not create new injustices in our haste, out of the best motives. Memoirs by the comrades in arms of particular historical figures and reminiscences about them by relatives are being published. You read them and believe that they are correct assessments and opinions consonant with our times. But what if you check the paper images against the facts and with true events and roles? Will present publications not have to be rewritten in time?

[Marov] We were aware of this danger. Whatever may be said about obviousness, we acted correctly in that we approached the review of the case in an extremely serious manner, setting ourselves just one goal, which we pursued rigorously: to proceed only according to the law and strictly observe all the juridical and procedural norms envisaged in such cases.

[Bodnaruk] What does the case consist of?

[Marov] Approximately 100 volumes of investigative and court material.

[Bodnaruk] Is it possible to study such a volume of material in a comparatively short period?

[Marov] It is impossible for one man, but we had many very skilled assistants. The situation was facilitated by the fact that each of them dealt with an individual specific defendant in the trial. This was the principle, incidentally, used to group materials for the investigation and the judicial hearing. In my opinion, one other fact is of considerable significance: As you know, 10 people in this case were fully rehabilitated in the fifties and later on the same grounds. Professor D.D. Pletnev was the last to be rehabilitated, last year. I was among those who studied this case since I already knew a great deal about it.

How was the work organized? What did you and your comrades do?

[Marov] I repeat that each of us studied the preliminary investigation materials for a specific defendant, analyzed the evidence, and prepared our findings. As for the trial materials, it was largely I who had to carry out this work. Many other members of the plenum were also acquainted with the case material, as I have already said, and the final documents were prepared collectively.

[Bodnaruk] As I understand it, you proceeded on the basis of [then] current legislative norms and were guided by today's moral criteria. But in 1938 the judges lived in another atmosphere and in another system of values....

[Marov] I will make no secret of the fact that this question cost me and my comrades many sleepless nights—scrupulousness is necessary in everything here. But it is obvious that the legislative acts of the time, although less sophisticated than those now in force, nevertheless made it possible to correctly investigate a case and pronounce a just decision. Have a look: At that time the deviations in judicial practice with regard to criminal cases were not as serious as those in political trials. And in the case of Bukharin there was total arbitrariness and total disregard for the law. Our task was to be absolutely objective and assess what happened then by the yardsticks of the legislation then in force. Excluding emotions. The law alone! Only juridical evidence or rebuttals.

[Bodnaruk] Excuse me for making the distinction, it is, of course, artificial, but nonetheless: You are a lawyer but you are also a man. How old were you at the time of the trial against Bukharin, Rykov, and the others?

[Marov] I understand what you are saying. I was in school then. Yes, I, like the overwhelming majority, thought these men were enemies of the people. Both then and much later we were convinced that Bukharin and the others were trying to return the country to the bosom of the old social relations. I will not hide the fact that even for me, a lawyer, it was at first psychologically difficult to give up these ideas. But this is the truth.

[Bodnaruk] What can you say then about others? Will people of the older generation, who are accustomed to other ideas, understand and accept the Supreme Court decision?

[Marov] I think that there will inevitably be people who will not understand and accept straightaway the entire truth. But you can't change it. They must change their ideas and change themselves. Let us be sober and firm. Let us think not only about ourselves, but about our children and grandchildren.

[Bodnaruk] What if M.S. Gorbachev hadn't made his assessments of that period and of individual political personalities at the ceremonial session 2 November last year?

[Marov] First, the assessments voiced in the report have been arrived at with much suffering by the party and the people. They reflect collective thoughts, and are not dictated by anything apart from the desire to affirm the truth about the past—for the sake of the present and the future. Second. It is obvious that, if not now, then tomorrow, truth and justice will prevail. I am glad that this has been done now. I am glad that neither the general secretary, nor the public, nor any of us has shifted the resolution of these questions onto another time and other people's shoulders. It was up to us to do it. And we have done it.

[Bodnaruk] Our contemporaries know little about Bukharin. Some read about him in reports on the trial. I, for example, was very surprised by the description given of Bukharin in one article—he seems a very impulsive, unbalanced, weak man. Is this confirmed by the case material?

[Marov] No. He was not overemotional and weak. This is obvious from his final speech at the trial. The ordeal was extremely cruel and the trial was a thorough test of his character. No, he was a fighter to the end, despite the conditions in which he found himself. His final speech shows firmness, consistency, rigorous logic, but no signs of heightened emotionality.

[Bodnaruk] What would you say about his opinions, in what was Bukharin right and in what was he mistaken?

[Marov] I cannot answer this question. There is scarcely anyone who is now prepared to give an exhaustive description of Bukharin as a politician and theorist. It is not up to judges and scientists to carry out the equally painstaking but far more complex work of studying and analyzing his activity. I do not doubt one thing—as in justice, there can be no haste and rough drafts in this matter.

This event will go down in history not only because truth and justice triumphed 4 February, exactly 50 years later. It is important not so much for the dead as for us, the living. Justice has triumphed. And this is territory won by democratization and glasnost.

'Victims' of Repression

LD052039 Moscow World Service in English 1910 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Excerpts] Here in Moscow a full-scale session of the USSR Supreme Court has exonerated 20 prominent leaders of the Soviet Communist Party and state, among them Nikolay Bukharin and Aleksey Rykov. More details from Aleksandr Putko:

The exoneration of Nikolay Bukharin and Aleksey Rykov was awaited here for a long time. Under the current process of democratization and openness historical truth is being established, and we are learning more and more details about the life and activity of the first communists, who together with Lenin fought for the Soviet Government and initiated the construction of socialism in this country. Many of them became victims of Stalin's repressive measures. Nikolay Bukharin and Aleksey Rykov were among them. [passage omitted on biographical details of Bukharin and Rykov and quoting Gorbachev's speech on the 70th anniversary of the 1917 revolution]

The official exoneration of Nikolay Bukharin and Aleksey Rykov is yet another step in socialist democracy and proof that the changes taking place in Soviet society are irreversible.

Press Eliminating 'Blank Spots' in History

LD051714 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] A series of new publications in the Soviet press have continued to eliminate the blank spots in the country's history. The magazine KOMMUNIST has carried the text of a report made by Communist Party leader Nikolay Bukharin at a memorial meeting in 1929 to mark 5 years since the death of Lenin. This and other similar publications give the reader a chance to get a better idea of Bukharin as a political leader. He was one of the associates of Lenin, and then fell victim to Stalin's purges.

The sociologist Dr Bestuzhev-Lada in his article in the weekly NEDELYA looks into the sources of the Stalin personality cult. He points out that in the 1930's the nation departed from the Leninist principles of democratic centralism to directly opposite principles of bureaucratic centralism. The scientist says a back-transition is the essence of the perestroyka underway in this country.

Uzbek CP Leaders Lambasted at CC Plenum

PM051701 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Feb 88 Second Edition p 2

[Own correspondent V. Artemenko report under the rubric "Party Life: Elective Organs' Reports": "There Is No Sidestepping the Lessons of Truth"]

[Text] Tashkent—The situation in Uzbekistan has been causing concern among the republic's Communists and working people for a long time. The lessons of truth which rang out from the rostrum of the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee plenums—this was the yardstick to be applied to the work of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Plenum which discussed the bureau's accounts of its work in the leadership of restructuring. On the whole the discussion was critical and impartial.

Members of the Central Committee Bureau had to listen to much criticism leveled at them, criticism which was dictated by dissatisfaction at the progress of restructuring in the republic and serious miscalculations in its leadership. Speakers noted that the Central Committee Bureau had failed to overcome the inertia of the stagnation phenomena and trends in the development of the economy and culture and in orgnizational and political work. It had not always displayed firmness in the assessment of negative phenomena and their perpetrators.

"The process of renewal is proceeding with difficulty in the republic, it barely manages to keep going, and needs a lot of push," I. Karimov, first secretary of Kashka Darya Party Obkom, said, sharing his observations. "There is evidence of indifference and complacency and of presenting wishful thinking as reality."

Naturally, this self-deception had affected economic results noticeably. And they are alarming. Thus, national income, which was to have increased by 10.7 percent over 2 years, in actual fact increased only by 1.4 percent. The gross social product fell short by R4.2 billion. And what is worse—embezzlement, overreporting, and bribery persist.

The plenum participants rightly demanded the reasons for all this from the Central Committee Bureau, which spends a lot of time formulating all manner of measures but does not back them up with concrete organizational work. Not one of the six comprehensive programs for the industrial complex approved by the Central Committee Bureau is being fully implemented. This was noted with concern by U. Sultanova, party committee secretary at the Tashkent Textile Combine, B. Khakimov, chairman of Namangan Oblispolkom, and others. They named specific Bureau members—G. Kadyrov, chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, and A. Ikramov, Central Committee secretary—who are neglecting many questions within their sphere of competence.

Speakers declared from the plenum rostrum that it is necessary to accelerate the switch from administrative and bureaucratic methods of management to economic methods of management, and to implement the principles of radical reform more thoroughly. A substantial number of the republic's enterprises has already switched to full economic accountability [kozraschet] and self-financing, but by no means everywhere has a breakthrough in performance been achieved. The inertia of old approaches and recurring instances of irresponsibility and freeloading attitudes cannot but leave a mark.

Central Committee Secretary V. Lobko has been censured for lack of exactingness toward the leaders of construction organizations and tolerance of shortcomings. That is putting it mildly. In actual fact V. Lobko is shielding construction workers from criticism. For instance, last summer a just-completed 17-story building collapsed. Local newspapers reported this extraordinary incident. Addressing a Central Committee Bureau session V. Lobko accused journalists of "sensationalism" and declared that what had happened was simply.... an accident.

In January A. Dyulov, a war and labor veteran, wrote to the local PRAVDA correspondent office. In his view, a recent Central Committee plenum, which had been devoted to problems of cotton growing, had failed to provide an answer to many fundamental questions. The veteran was right. The current Central Committee plenum revealed mistakes in this sphere. V. Antonov, Central Committee secretary, and I. Dzhurabekov, chairman of the Uzbek SSR Gosagroprom, were criticized in virtually every speech. And there was plenty to criticize them for. Instead of the planned increase, the volume of gross agricultural output actually decreased during the first 2 years of the 5-year plan. The plenum demanded that more resolute steps be taken to improve the situation in the agro-industrial complex.

There was a serious debate about the demographic situation. The population growth rate in the republic is more than triple the union average. Only 32.9 percent of the republic's able-bodied population are working. Speakers noted that the Central Committee Bureau, the republic's government, and the public at large must conduct purposeful organizational and explanatory work with a view to ensuring sensible family planning and the improvement of the standard of people's working and living conditions.

Special criticism was leveled at the Central Committee Bureau by the plenum for omissions in ideological work. Here a radical breakthrough is a long way off. The situation as regards religion remains complex. The following example was cited. M. Sherkulov, former first secretary of Samarkandskiy party raykom, personally took part in the construction and fitting out of what was described as a "holy place."

Self-immolation by women protesting the degradation of their honor and human dignity continues in Uzbekistan. Over the past 2 years there have been 270 of these scandalous cases. Among the casualties are students and Komsomol members. Yet what are the party organizations doing about it? They shut their eyes to it and try to cover up the nature of this disgraceful phenomenon with farfetched excuses.

Flaws in the work of Central Committee Secretary M. Khalmukhamedov, who is responsible for ideology, were convincingly exposed at the plenum. He is obviously not firm and consistent enough. The solution of cadre questions is dragged out, ideological departments have no clearly defined policy, and their efficiency is low. When M. Khalmukhamedov took the floor, everyone thought that he would give an account of plans to restructure ideological work and update its forms and methods. However, the Central Committee secretary spent 20 minutes blaming the confounded period of stagnation, ticking off leaders of grassroots party organizations and creative unions, apportioning blame, and issuing appeals. Yet the plenum did not get to hear from him a specific program for the restructuring of ideological work.

However, it was V. Khaydurov, candidate member of the Central Committee Bureau and chairman of the republic People's Control Committee, who probably most disappointed those present. His speech resembled a report on the work of the committee over the past year; he cited some 30 figures, but he failed to name a single name. The speech of the "chief watchdog" was full of pompous phrases. It was as if the accountability report, when it mentioned the fact that the committee he heads has failed to show persistence in the eradication of embezzlement, overreporting, and other manifestations of mismanagement, and that he himself lacks initiative and tries to avoid making a critical analysis of major painful problems, was not talking about him.

Certain other speakers, unfortunately, also followed the old line. Their speeches lacked candor and were full of boring attempts at self-justification. Many speeches were interspersed with requests and traditional assurances from start to finish. A. Manannikov, republic minister of construction, and V. Alimov, first secretary of Fergana party gorkom, used the platform for mutual recriminations and self-justification. The speech of I. Iskanderov, chairman of the republic's Gosplan, would have been fine at an economic conference, but not at a Central Committee plenum.

The hypnotic personality worship which has deep roots in the republic was also in evidence at the plenum. R. Nishanov, the recently elected first secretary of the Central Committee, spoke out resolutely in his closing speech against the great-leader-syndrome [vozhdizm] and called on party activists to practice collective decisionmaking in leadership and to display mutual exactingness irrespective of official position.

This thinking also rang out in other speeches. The plenun participants noted with concern that it is impermissible to forget Lenin's behest about the inevitability of punishment, the moral responsibility of cadres for their actions, and intolerance of shortcomings. It is not a question of a tough attitude being taken, of "flagellation" of cadres, but of the prestige of the republic's party organization and its ability to cleanse itself.

"We, the ordinary people," R. Ivanushkina, a seamstress at the Karshinskoye Clothing Association, said, "have faith in the republic's leadership. But what happens in reality? Not a plenum passes without someone being expelled from the bureau, be it for bribe-taking, or gross miscalculations, or... health reasons, although everyone can guess why. How can you expect people to have complete trust in that case? The time has come to make the Central Committee Bureau completely sound, so that all the people who constitute it are capable of working honestly and hard and set an example by their actions. I propose that one or two workers are co-opted onto the Central Committee Bureau. Not for the sake of appearances. And not reticent people, but sharp-tongued ones, real bolsheviks. With their help it will be possible to take the working people's views more fully into account, and they will also prevent other Bureau members from adopting too liberal an attitude when it comes to making an assessment of "the big boss [bolshoye nachalstvo]."

M. Ibragimov, chairman of the republic's State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports, V. Anishchev, Central Committee second secretary, and others spoke about the need of the cadre corps to rid iself more resolutely of incompetent leaders and of the rot of corruption, total license, and mutual back-scratching.

The plenum participants were unanimous that life itself will test every Uzbek Communist's strength and consistency. It will not pardon the slightest weakness. What is needed is an uncompromising struggle against everything that is hampering the eradication of negative phenomena.

Gromyko Speaks to Lithuanian Aktiv

LD051937 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 5 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" Newscast]

[Text] Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko's stay in Lithuania is continuing:

[Correspondent A. Laulyus, identified by caption] Today Comrade Gromyko took part in a party and soviet aktiv conference of the Lithuanian SSR. This year is a jubilee year for the republic: 70 years ago, the Communist Party was formed and Soviet rule was established in Lithuania. Lithuania today is a republic with a highly developed economy, modern science, and culture. A new stage in development has begun. On the conference agenda is the progress made in implementing the decisions of the July 1987 CPSU Central Committee plenum regarding the radical restructuring of Economic management and social development in the Lithuanian SSR, and tasks involved in further improving the work of executive committees of the Soviets of People's Deputies. Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko delivered a speech at the conference, saying in part:

[Begin Gromyko recording] Dear comrades. What is our conversation today about? The topic is simple and clear. There is a need—and you feel it yourselves—to discuss in detail several problems confronting the republic. As a CPSU central Committee Politburo member, I want to obtain information first hand, as they say, about your state of affairs. Needless to say, I will express some thoughts on behalf of the leadership. Thousands of strands of economic ties extend from Lithuanian soil to the most remote corners of the union. That is a natural process in a socialist state. The party is mobilizing all forces for the fulfilment of the tasks of the current, decisive stage in restructuring. Here key positions must be taken by the bodies of people's power, the soviets. I want to dwell on that issue, particularly.

What is characteristic of the work of the soviets today? Of course, a process of invigorating and improving their work is taking place. The ability for work is growing. Their influence in all areas of life is also growing. All that is true. It is noticeable. But, comrades, fairness requires that we admit that they have certainly not done everything demanded by the party and people. When carrying out fundamental economic reform, it is necessary to remember that the unity of the social and economic development in the regions is one of the main principles by which the party guides the people and which is enshrined in laws. This follows objectively, primarily from the unity of interests of all the labor collectives, enterprises, and organizations located in the soviets' territory, and the inhabitants of the villages, settlements, and towns. What does this interest consist of? Creating an industrial and social structure, and an organization of housing and public services, trade, public catering, health care, and household services that ensure high production indicators and, simultaneously, the most favorable conditions for people's life and work. In other words, it consists in seeing that it is better for the Soviet person to work and live in our land.

The first results of the restructuring and of the work under the new conditions that we see in the Lithuanian republic have—let us be forthright—been quite good. In the first 2 years of the 5-year Plan, the increase in the volume of the republic's industrial output was more than 10 percent and the increase in its agricultural output more than 11 percent. A considerable amount has been done, too, to develop the social sphere.

However, we must look the truth in the eyes. Difficulties have arisen, and will yet arise, in the law's implementation. Not all of the republic's enterprises are ready for work in the new conditions, and you perhaps know better than I that this is so.

Let us take a look at the plans for output. These plans have not been fulfilled by 14 of your enterprises; 27 enterprises did not reach their targets for increasing labor productivity—as many as 27 enterprises! Twenty-two enterprises lagged behind in producing consumer goods.

Currently, we are concentrating increasing attention on the work effectiveness of the Soviets of People's Deputies and of other state bodies, and in this regard, attention is being paid to their efficiency, not in increasing the number of sittings and issues considered and the amount of paperwork, but in pracitcal deeds.

What can one say today about the level of organizational work by the soviets? Not everything is well in this respect. Soviets' sessions often proceed in the old way. There is still much standardization at them and too little initiative, criticism, and perhaps glasnost, too.

The question has been specially raised at our conference on the role of executive committees and on their work under the guidance of soviets, and their accountability and responsibility. This is a very important matter. There are still facts showing that executive committees are taking the place of soviets of deputies, and there are indeed cases in not just the executive committee, but even the executive committee apparatus and individual functionaries, where the executive committee apparatus is deciding relevant issues, while the deputies stay somewhere on the side. This is, of course, abnormal. However, you are unfortunately not alone in this regard. Complaints are being received from certain republics about the rudeness of executive committee functionaries and of delays in deciding affairs of concern to the people. Indeed, in their reports the executive committees frequently show only the successes.

The cardinal transformations now taking place in the Soviet Union, including the Lithuanian republic, and the increased international prestige of the Soviet state are all attracting the attention of both our friends and our enemies. How can we respond to this? Above all by succeeding in economic development and the tackling of social problems, and succeeding in the sphere of culture. It is essential to see that each of our citizens in practice feels the advantages of the socialist way of life.

The whole atmosphere in society, within the family, at school, in literature and art, should effectively instill in the population, including young people, a sense of Soviet patriotism. We must vigorously display our irreconcilability with any form of nationalism or neglect for the interests of the Soviet state. It is necessary to fight uncompromisingly against those who are turning a sense of patriotism into the object of petty local politicking. There is no room for this in our country, and there is no demand for it by the people.

Lately there has been an acceleration of ideological diversion against Soviet Lithuania and our other Baltic republics. Using isolated antisocial elements, hostile bourgeois propaganda has been trying to kindle national dissension. The depth and scope of the changes in all spheres of state and social life, the broadening of democracy, the irreversible character of these processes, and the ensuring of equal rights and liberties for people of all nationalities in our country all serve in themselves as a worthy response to the slanderers, wherever they are, near or afar.

The friendship of the peoples is one of the main supports for the unity and stability of the Soviet state, and it is our sacred duty to guard it for the property of all the people. [applause] [end recording]

Vilnius Report

LD051507 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 5 Feb 88

[text] A conference of leading workers of soviet bodies ,with the participation of the republic's party-economic aktiv, took place in Vilnius today. The conference discussed the course of fulfillment of decisions of the June 1987 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on the fundamental restructuring of economic management, the development of the social sphere in the republic, and tasks connected with further perfecting the work of executive committees of soviets of people's deputies.

Participants in the conference greeted Comrade Gromyko with applause. Songayla, Astrauskas, Berezov, Bernatavichyus, Brazauskas, Gedraytis, Ludauskas, Maksimovas, Mikuchyauskas, Mitkin, Sakalauskas, Shepetis, Shileykis, Zaletskas, Sheris; Deputy chairmen of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium and of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers; and other senior party and local soviet workers also came to the conference.

Astrauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, opened the conference with an introductory speech.

Sakalauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers, delivered a speech at the conference on the course of fulfillment of decisions of the June 1987 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on the fundamental restructuring of economic management, the development of the social sphere in the republic, and tasks connected with further perfecting the work of executive committees of soviets of people's deputies.

Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko made a speech at the conference which was warmly received. On that note the conference ended its work.

Visits Housing Developments

LD052352 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" Newscast]

[Text] In the afternoon, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko visited new districts in Vilnius. The volume of housing construction in Lithuania is growing more slowly than demand. Thus, last year, 30,500 apartments were commissioned, but there are about 140,000 families in the line of those wishing to improve their housing conditions. Moreover, it hardly decreased at all last year.

Comrade Gromyko inquired about the measures that were being taken to solve the problem. The building of districts of small detached houses is beginning in towns, but it is necessary to develop the building materials industry more quickly and also to organize on cooperative lines the construction resources of different departments.

Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko visited one of the new shopping centers in Vilnius. In conversations, customers pointed out that the supply of goods was improving. Nevertheless, they want to see goods in a wider range and always of good quality.

Leaves Vilnius for Moscow

LD051909 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] Vilnius February 5 TASS—Andrey Gromyko, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet who was staying in the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius, left for Moscow tonight.

Zaykov Examines Problems at 'Dinamo' Association

PM051029 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Acting With Initiative"]

[Text] Moscow's S.M. Kirov "Dinamo" Association is one of our ountry's largest enterprises for the production of electrical equipment. Only recently it was among the flagships of Moscow industry and output with the plant's label—unique electric engines for ships and the subway, powerful trucks, and other equipment—enjoying a deserved recognition not only in our country but also abroad. The collective is well known for its revolutionary and labor traditions. In 1921 V.I. Lenin addressed the working people here.

The need for the association's output is constantly growing. But for a number of years now it has failed to cope with the fulfillment of plans for the most important indicators. The transition to new conditions of economic management has revealed the "sore points" even more: the intolerably high percentage of manual labor, breakdowns in manufacturing and contract discipline, and, the main thing, the lack of a considered concept of development and retooling. The insufficient attention toward the development of the social sphere has become the reason for the departure of skilled cadres. Parasitical sentiments and the lack of initiative of the "Dinamo" Administration mingle with blatant indifference to its fate on the part of the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, which is not concerned with modernization, the creation of corresponding labor conditions, or the plan's balance with material and technical resources.

As a result there has been a marked deterioration in the quality of the output produced and inefficient use is made of equipment, a substantial proportion of which is already obsolete. The association's debts are growing. The plan for contract deliveries was fulfilled by only 94 percent last year. The situation was somewhat stabilized in the first month of the new year.

The reasons for the prevailing situation and ways of eliminating the difficulties were examined 3 February at the association by L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, with the participation of leaders of the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, the enterprise, the labor collective council, and the Moscow Gorispolkom.

It was noted that "Dinamo's" grave problems cannot be resolved by a wave of the hand. The association and its output can only be restored to their former glory through painstaking, persistent, and, most importantly, harmonious work by the economic leaders and party organization and entire collective of many thousands, by emerging onto the main avenues of scientific and technical progress. The key to a return to the ranks of leading enterprises lies today primarily in developing the initiative of each person—from worker to director. The labor collective council must involve workers and engineers more persistently in the solution of specific questions of improving the enterprise's activity, primarily the introduction of economic accountability [khozraschet] within the production facility and the raising of teams' responsibility for saving resources and improving the quality of output.

Constructive assistance from the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry is also necessary. It should consist primarily in the development of a general plan for retooling the enterprise, improving the range of output produced, and providing "Dinamo" with all necessary resources.

It was emphasized that similar plans should be formulated at all Moscow enterprises whose technical standard is blatantly lagging behind modern requirements. They

will become a component of the "Progress-95" Comprehensive Territorial-Sectorial Program for the Intensification of Moscow's Economy. The sector's minister, O.G. Anfimov, assured the collective that the program for the stabilization of the association's work and its further development will be examined by the ministry collegium and placed under strict control.

A real breakthrough is needed with regard to the collective's working, daily living, and leisure conditions. All the projected plans must ultimately accord with the interests of the working people and serve to increase their well-being. B.T. Saykin, chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom, reported that additional steps will be taken during the current 5-year plan to improve cultural and consumer and housing conditions for the association's workers.

Workers and specialists expressed ardent support during talks for the course which is being steered under the party's leadership toward restructuring, the implementation of radical economic reform, and the further democratization of social life.

The remarkable revolutionary traditions of one of the capital's oldest enterprises is a guarantee that it can cope with setbacks and emerge on leading positions. In preparing for the 19th all-union party conference, the "Dinamo" communists and labor collective must, by the time it opens, overcome the disruption which has been allowed, and begin the countdown to acceleration.

At a meeting with bureau members and workers of the apparatus of the Proletarskiy CPSU Raykom, there was an examination of the tasks of enhancing the communists' vanguard role in implementing restructuring. In implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, the party committees must constantly improve the style and methods of political leadership and develop daily organizational, ideological, and political education work in the labor collectives and at people's places of residence. In the atmosphere of glasnost and principledness, we must cite the specific culprits in every case of disruption and stoppage and involve the masses in the discussion of ways of overcoming the difficulties which arise and in ensuring specific results in the renewal of all aspects of social life.

The Church of the Birth of Our Lady, where the remains of the heroes of the battle of Kulikovo, Oslyabya and Peresvet, are laid and which is under state protection, is situated on the territory of the "Dinamo" Association. There was an examination of questions connected with its restoration. The Moscow Gorispolkom and the association's administration were instructed to carry out a package of work making it possible soon to open the priceless monument of Russian culture to visitors. A conservation zone including the restored Krutitskiy house and Simonov monastery has been created in the capital's Proletarskiy Rayon with the active participation of the rayon soviet deputies, public, and specialist restorers.

Zaykov, Yazov at Radio Ministry Meeting

LD052357 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A session of the USSR Ministry of the Radio Industry collegium was held today to analyze the state of affairs, to note a number of serious shortcomings in the industry's work and to lay down specific ways of surmounting them. Comrade Zaykov spoke at the collegium session. It was attended by Comrade Yazov and by senior officials from the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR State Planning Committee, ministries and departments.

Nikonov, Other Leaders Attend Workers Meeting

LD052353 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In the Culumned Hall of the House of Unions today there was a meeting of People's Control workers, activists, and representatives of the capital's working people and public, devoted to the 70th anniversary of the bodies of socialist control. In the presidium were Comrades Nikonov, Demichev, Talyzin, Razumovskiy, and Kapitonov, and the heads of a number of ministries and departments.

The rapporteur, Comrade Manyakin, chairman of the USSR Committee of People's Control, noted that nowadays, under perestroyka, it iss the primary task of the socialist control bodies to prevent and resolutely stop any slackness and lack of discipline, and to fight the various kinds of abuses, inefficiency, false accounting, and the production of shoddy goods.

Those attending the meeting emphasized that People's Control must become extremely open and take place in full view of everyone. Only glasnost would help cure social ills more quickly and to warn people agianst repeating mistakes.

Broader View of Lenin's Testament Advocated

PM081228 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Feb 88 Second Edition p 2

[Academician N. Kim article under the rubric "Questions ofTheory": "Leninism and the Historical Destiny of Socialism"]

[Text] It is hard to overestimate the significance of Lenin's conclusion on the possibility of proletarian revolution within the framework of a single country. It was

a new contribution to Marxist science. It radically changed the idea of the conditions for the victory of socialism: A real prospect of the struggle for the triumph of the new society opened up before the international proletariat and its national detachments.

"Revolutions are not made by order or by agreement," Lenin said (Complete Collected Works, Vol 37, p 64). This proposition is particularly true in relation to the socialist revolution, which differs from all the past revolutionary coups by its particularly profound radicalism. As Vladimir Ilich explained in a letter to American workers (1918), "circumstances have pushed forward **our**, Russian, detachment of the socialist proletariat" (ibid.). In the October Revolution international and domestic Russian circumstances were interwoven and, acting together, determined our country's choice of its path of development.

The practical implementation of socialism was far from a simple or easy matter. The historical situation which Russia found itself in after the February revolution was complex and "confused."

V.I. Lenin assessed the situation dialectically and showed the country the one true path to real progress. "You cannot stand still—in history in general, in wartime in particular. It is necessary to go either forward or backward. To go forward, in 20th-century Russia, which has won a republic and democracy by revolutionary means, is **impossible** without **moving** toward socialism, taking **steps** toward it" (Vol 34, p 192). He set the strategic task of the transition from the bourgeois democratic stage to the socialist stage of revolution and elaborated a line of preparation for a socialist revolution.

But total unity in the understanding of this course did not exist within the party's ranks. It was necessary to overcome the resistance of dogmatists and pedants, skeptics and capitulators, who rejected Lenin's course, claiming that it was premature for Russia, that it lacked "historical preparation."

The opponents of the principle of socialist revolution in Russia, echoing the favorite dogma of the opportunists of the Second International, "argued" their position in particular on the basis that the proletariat was an overall minority of the country's population. But the communists were guided in their policy by Lenin's proposition that "the strength of the proletariat in any capitalist country is incomparably greater than the proletariat's share of the total population numbers" (Vol 40, p 23). The experience of the October Revolution confirmed this convincingly and graphically. In the course of preparations for its implementation, the Bolshevik party was able to unite the working class' struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism with the general democratic movement for peace, the peasants' movement for land, and the national liberation struggle of Russia's oppressed peoples.

The October Socialist Revolution is an example of a true people's revolution.

Great October accomplished an epochmaking change in the history of scientific socialism, which had previously existed only in the programs of Marxist parties and served as the ideological banner of the struggling proletarians. With the victory of October, as V.I. Lenin noted, socialism "...entered the sphere of practical work. Now the workers and peasants are making socialism with their own hands.... Today we can speak of socialism only from experience" (Vol 36, pp 498, 499).

K. Marx and F. Engels, by turning socialism from a utopia into a science, brought about a revolution in the social consciousness. In the course of the development of socialism it was necessary to go further—from understanding the world to transforming it, from a revolution in consciousness to a revolution in social existence.

The fateful significance of the historic achievements of the first socialist country is not confined within national limits: It is profoundly international. Great October and the victory of socialism in the USSR were the starting point and the firm foundation for a new stage in the history of proletarian socialism.

The October Revolution had a mighty influence on the international workers' movement and helped to combine it with scientific socialism.

The most important event after October, an event which determined a radical change in the struggle between socialism and capitalism, was the formation of the world socialist system. Capitalism is now opposed by real world socialism, with its achievements and potential.

The revolutionary transforming role of socialism is not the only force for social progress. As M.S. Gorbachev has noted, "we are far from thinking that all the progressive changes which take place in the world are due to socialism alone." At the same time it is an irrefutable truth that in the quest for solutions to mankind's most important problems, in historical progress, socialism is the leading, decisive force.

In the history of Soviet society, by a combination of circumstances—objective and subjective, internal and external—situations have repeatedly arisen in which, with varying degrees of urgency and scale, the party and people have faced a vital question of the revolutionary transformation of the world—the question to be or not to be, for socialism. To the honor of the Communist Party and the Soviet people, in the USSR socialism has always won the day.

The successes of the October Revolution and its first constructive steps were associated with the unique circumstance that they took place under the direct leadership of V.I. Lenin. In him the party and people had a

leader of the new, communist type. The spirit of authoritarianism, and, still more, political adventurism, was alien to him. He exercised leadership not so much on the basis of the authority of power as on the basis of the power of authority. Lenin's activity was always subordinated to the people's interests and will. At the same time it was directed toward improving those interests and that will in every way. Toward ensuring that they were in harmony with the high ideals of communism.

The victory of October marked a new stage in the history of Leninism, first and foremost in the development of Lenin's theory of socialism. This was associated with a radical change in the nature of the correlation of theory and practice and in the historical conditions of theoretical creativity, and with an urgent need for new achievements in this sphere. V.I. Lenin noted that "we adopted an entirely practical approach to tasks which had formerly been posed in abstract, theoretical terms" (Vol 36, p 383). This fact dictated not a weakening, but, on the contrary, an all-around strengthening of the role of theory.

Real socialism is richer, more complex, and more contradictory than socialism in ideas. Reacting energetically to the urgent needs of the time, V.I. Lenin constantly enriched the theoretical arsenal of revolution and socialism. Of course, he did not claim to foresee everything that lay ahead. In summarizing concrete historical experience, Lenin was dealing with the first steps in the formation of socialist reality. Naturally, his conception of socialism is of a general nature. But the fundamental conclusions, the ideas born from the study of life itself and the objective trends in its development in systemic unity, provided reliable guidance for the party and people in their transforming and creative activity.

V.I. Lenin completed the elaboration of the concept of socialism in his last works. In these works the question of the future of socialism in the USSR holds a central place. Using additional theoretical and historical arguments, Lenin substantiated with new force the possibility of building socialism in our country; he expressed the profound confidence that "from the Russia of the NEP [New Economic Policy], a socialist Russia will come."

V.I. Lenin's last articles and letters were received by the party and people as his political testament, a testament calling for the building of socialism in the USSR.

Certain authors, when they speak of V.I. Lenin's political testament, mean exclusively the content of the "Letter to the Congress," in which, along with other features, there is a characterization of certain party leaders. Here they place the emphasis on the characterization of the personal qualities of Trotskiy and Stalin and on Lenin's proposal that they think about a means of removing the latter from the post of general secretary of the party Central Committee and appointing someone else to that post. Certain authors are inclined to take a negative view of the fact that the 13th party congress did not follow V.I. Lenin's advice, and left I. Stalin in the post of general secretary, associating this unequivocally with the subsequent emergence of his personality cult.

But historical truth requires us to emphasize two aspects. Confining V.I. Lenin's political testament solely to the content of his "Letter to the Congress" unjustifiably narrows, and therefore distorts our understanding of Lenin's political testament. The above document should be seen in the overall context of the testament on building socialism in the USSR, as a component part of it. As for the question of the decision by delegations to the 13th congress to leave I.V. Stalin in the post of general secretary, this must be seen in the light of the historical situation. It must be taken into account that Trotskiy and the Trotskiyists, as emerged clearly after V.I. Lenin's death, were opponents of Lenin's idea of building socialism in the USSR. It is also necessary to remember the highly complex international situation and the mortal threat to the young soviet state from the capitalist encirclement.

"Today," M.S. Gorbachev noted at the ceremonial session devoted to the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution, "there is much discussion of Stalin's role in our history. His personality is extremely contradictory." The party's leading nucleus, headed by Stalin, upheld Leninism and formulated the strategy and tactics for the initial stage of socialist building. Stalin's contribution to the struggle for socialism and the defense of its gains is indisputable.

At the same time Stalin committed gross political errors, tyranny, lawlessness, and mass repressions. For all this our people paid a great price, and it had grave consequences for our society's life. And Stalin knew, contrary to certain assertions, about the instances of lawlessness. Documents exist on this score. Stalin's guilt in all this is enormous and unforgivable.

The voluntarist approach to the resolution of socioeconomic problems and the administrative decree methods of leadership which became established at that time continued to operate to a significant extent in the subsequent decades.

Objective circumstances existed which determined the difficulties of socialist building for the USSR and the associated errors and mistakes. But the main reasons for the negative phenomena were subjective in nature. The key cause was the insufficiently attentive attitude to V.I. Lenin's ideological and theoretical legacy and inconsistency in the practical implementation of the ideas and requirements of Leninism.

The Leninist concept of socialism itself did not undergo due creative development. The new practical experience was not subjected to serious theoretical interpretation, and the legacy of our state's founder was not thereby enriched. As a rule, some people took a dogmatic view of Lenin's propositions and only commented on them,

others built up all kinds of pedantic structures around them, and yet others simply consigned them to oblivion or distorted and misrepresented them to suit their own subjective views.

The subjective circumstances which had arisen promoted a situation where ideas about socialism, about its nature, and about the specific ways, methods, time scale, and pace of building it which did not conform to the realities became established in the theoretical and general consciousness.

In 70 years our country has traveled a path of major achievements. However, there have also been serious errors which prevented us from making full use of the advantages of the socialist system and effectively realizing the potential inherent in its nature. As a consequence of this, the socialist society we have built, in terms of its maturity and social effectiveness, is as yet far below the possible and necessary level of development. The times dictate the need to accelerate its progress. The attainment of this goal is the aim of the restructuring, whose purpose is expressed by the demand **"more socialism, more democracy"**.

The concept of restructuring is a creative development of the Leninist theory of socialism, while the restructuring itself is a resurgent and creative continuation of the revolutionary practice of Leninism. Restructuring is a multifaceted, complex process. But the main avenue, and at the same time the key mechanism, of its implementation is democratization. This is determined by the very nature of socialism, whose building, according to Leninism, is a matter for the historical creativity of millions of people. Democratization is the essence of the restructuring, the essence of socialism. This concise formula organically merges our objective and the means of achieving it at the present stage of communist creation.

Execution, Rehabilitation of Commander Recalled

PM041431 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jan 88 p 4

[Vladimir Karpenko article: " 'The Proletariat Will Restore My Good Name....'"]

[Excerpts] "The proletariat will restore my good name.... "Those were Corps Commander B.M. Dumenko's final words in court. Decades passed before justice was restored. But even today there are few who know the name of this outstanding hero of the Civil War.

More than 20 years ago I began my novel about Boris Dumenko with a fictional portrayal of his execution by firing squad. The censor did not pass that scene. It was just a page, no more than that. Five condemned men stood in a line at the edge of a freshly dug pit. I gave two or three sparing details about who was shot and how. The oldest was not yet 32, the youngest just 23.

I did not know all the details at that time. I only knew that Dumenko, along with members of his staff, had been sentenced to death by an assizes session of the republic's Revolutionary Military Tribunal and had been shot 11 May 1920. They were executed at 0400 hours in Nakhichevan Grove in Rostov-Na-Donu. I heard from someone who had actually taken part in carrying out the sentence. A retired general living in the Kuban who had lived his whole life in torment, unable to forget. He corrected some of the facts: The execution took place not in the city but on the outskirts, in the Kiziterinskaya Valley. They arrived in open carriages: They were brought to the edge of the pit tied together.

When the firing was over, one man, Sergey Kravchenko, chief of supply of the second brigade, was only slightly wounded, and before the grave was filled with earth, he moved aside the still warm bodies of his former comrades in arms above him, climbed out of the pit, and disappeared into the undergrowth...

The old general who carried out that sentence long ago sought a meeting with me. I was not interested in him. I did not go. I must admit that death does not inspire me as a writer, and a military writer, furthermore. I much prefer living heroes. Boris Dumenko's last hour was not his finest. The last 2 years of his legendary life were far more important to me.

For 44 years Dumenko's name was reviled and besmirched.

The thousands of volunteer red partisans and cavalrymen whose blades were rarely out of their hands for 2 years and who rushed into battle behind the broad-shouldered resilient leader in his red-trimmed fur cap and black sateen shirt riding his Panorama, a light chestnut mare with white legs and a white blaze—all those people were forced to keep quiet for many long years and not to say the word "Dumenko" aloud. The tragedy of our fathers and their fathers before them was unknown to us.

But the archives carefully preserve the truth about Dumenko. His combat career in the Civil War is unquestionable. [Passage omitted]

Who was Dumenko?

The cavalryman was not a complex figure. The times in which he lived and worked were complex. Some people, before his rehabilitation, tried to portray him as confused and erratic with socialist revolutionary tendencies and Makhnoist ways. They maliciously accused him of having aristocratic origins, knowing this to be false: They said that he was the only son of a Primanychskiy landowner.

On the contrary, Dumenko, the son of a peasant from another town, was a man of great integrity and courage. It was his nature—the healthy peasant nature of a man of

the land who knew from childhood the value of a piece of real bread produced by your own hands and who through education achieved a simple everyday wisdom at an early age—to work on the land and to enjoy the fruits of his own labor.

Dumenko had a martial streak, of course. But he had also been through a rich military schooling. Before the imperialist war he had actually served 4 years in a cavalry artillery regiment. He came back from the war a sergeant major.

A photograph of him taken in spring 1919 has been preserved—he is wearing a gray fur cap and a military jacket with the Order of the Red Banner and ribbon. His citation, a sheet of gray paper tightly folded in four, reads: "For continuous selfless work at the front and under fire, Chief of Division Comrade Dumenko is awarded a revolutionary distinction of honor—the Order of the Red Banner, as confirmed by the present document." The document is dated 7 March 1919. It was presented to him personally at Tsaritsyn by Trotskiy, chairman of the republic's Revolutionary Military Council. [Passage omitted]

Dumenko knew little of the intrigues that were taking place miles away at the corps' main headquarters: His life was one of combat, he was always in the saddle, and his saber was hardly ever out of his hand; He shared a sense of comradeship with his combat aides—the field staff—and his brigades. He hid his blood-stained handkerchief from the gaze of outsiders. He was weakened by anemia, and only his fame kept him going. And his enormous fame constantly worried some people....

The "opposition within the corps" was supported by Anisimov, a member of the 9th Army Revolutionary Military Council, who had come to Novocherkassk to congratulate the Combined Cavalry Corps on a victory it had won: He gave a telegram to Beloborodov at the Army Revolutionary Military Council: "Dumenko is a kind of Makhno, he will try to change sides, if not now then soon.... He sends his Red Army men to rob liquor stores, he rapes women, and openly agitates against the Soviets wherever he goes.... This is corroborated by Zhloba and others.... I believe he should be arrested soon with Zhloba's help.... Soon it will be too late, he will act for sure. They are talking about uniting with Budenny...." [Passage omitted]

The atmosphere surrounding the company commander and his staff, which had almost relaxed, became heated again. Dumenko was arrested by A.G. Beloborodov, a member of the 9th Army Revolutionary Military Council. He was awarded the Order of the Red Banner for that "operation." The citation attached to the award said: "Because Dumenko's name was too well known in the republic, Comrade Trotskiy did not dare arrest him, a recipient of the Order of the Red Banner. This was before the murder of Mikeladze. Comrade Mikeladze's murder leaves no doubt about the presence of a counter-revolutionary organization within the corps headquarters. Then in mid-February Comrade Beloborodov went to the cavalry corps on Comrade Trotskiy's orders and arrested the entire corps headquarters, headed by Dumenko."

No ordinary court tried the case. It was nothing less than an assize session of the republic's Revolutionary Military Tribunal. Rozenberg, deputy chairman of the Revolutionary Military Tribunal, was appointed judge.

Dumenko was supported by Ordzhonikidze, Yegorov, and Stalin, who was commander and member of the Southwestern Front Revolutionary Military Council, was well acquainted with Dumenko from Tsaritsyn, and tried to stand surety for him. Three of Pilsudski's armies were threatening the Soviet Ukraine. Yegorov assured Commander in Chief S.S. Kamenev: "Without a strong cavalry force success may be... difficult, even impossible, and Dumenko is a good organizer of cavalry units." Stalin, speaking on the hot line, expressed himself more categorically: "We must give the Poles a thrashing, that is why we need Dumenko." But Trotskiy had decided the verdict in advance.

The organizers of the trial forgot about one "insignificant detail"—the investigation. When there proved to be no evidence, Rozenberg exclaimed: "Do not be diverted by an overly detailed explanation of all the circumstances of the crime. If the salient features are clear then finish the trial, because the case is of great social significance...."

Carrying out Rozenberg's orders, the investigators did not seek to establish the objective facts of the case: The order was given to send to Rostov for interrogation only those people who could "give evidence about the anti-Soviet activity of Dumenko and his staff."

The organizers of the trial called Moscow on the hot line: "Warn the press in case someone blurts out something about Dumenko's exploits, it may be an embarrassment."

The judicial investigation was prejudiced. There were no witnesses: Even Peskarev, the most unrestrained witness and initiator of the whole affair, failed to come to court—Zhloba had him prosecuted by the revolutionary tribunal for cowardice. The defendants did not admit guilt: All the charges raised were refuted by the defense. But the prosecutor won the day.

Today it is possible to say that Dumenko was a victim of leftist, Trotskyist views of the Russian peasantry and its role in the socialist revolution. In the spring of 1920, after the rout of Denikin and the final expulsion of the big landowners, the laboring peasantry and the Cossacks were drawn to the land, which had been drenched with blood. Desertion increased and dissatisfaction manifested itself with the food requisitioning which had been

introduced in the newly liberated lands. In conditions where troops had to get their own supplies from the local population it was difficult to counter violations of discipline and plundering, especially on the part of the cavalry, who tried to restore their war-ravaged farms with "bourgeois property." The military department regarded all these phenomena as vestiges of the insurgency of 1918, as remnants of the Makhno movement. The revolutionary military tribunals, acting in the name of iron discipline and ensuring the combat capability of the Red Army, meted out merciless punishment to deserters and marauders. But they probably did not always take into account that petty bourgeois instincts had been instilled in the peasants through centuries of private small-scale farming. This and the inevitable wavering of the peasantry was mentioned more than once by Lenin, who believed that the alliance between the proletariat and the laboring peasantry must be strengthened above all by economic and political-educational means.

Trotsky advocated only one means with regard to the "reactionary" peasantry—the "punishing sword." And not just verbally, but in practice. Toward the end of the victorious civil war, won by a Red Army 90-percent composed of peasants, he embarked on the elimination of military leaders who had risen from the peasant masses. Their fame won in battles and paid for in blood undermined his own personality cult, which was intensively fostered in the Red Army by the Political Directorate of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic. Trotskiy saw the Red Army "created by himself" as a instrument of the struggle for power in the party and the state. People like Dumenko whose origins were among the people prevented him from relying on the army in the pursuit of this aim. The "Dumenko case" mirrors the theoretical views of Trotskiy and his supporters about building socialism and the practical means they intended to use for this purpose. [Passage omitted]

It is paradoxical that Dumenko's rehabilitation was made possible thanks to the debunking of Stalin's personality cult, although Dumenko himself was the victim of diametrically opposed forces. The mass rehabilitation of people against whom reprisals were applied in the late thirties inspired faith in Dumenko's family and comrades-in-arms that it was possible to restore justice. In February 1962 Anastasiya Dumenko, the widow of the corps commander, and veterans Kucherenko and Dyatluk wrote to N.S. Khrushchev. The Party Central Committee instructed the Main Military Prosecutor's Office to thoroughly check the "Dumenko case."

No statute of limitations applies to the rehabilitation of unjustly condemned people. However, it proved much more difficult to rehabilitate those on whom sentence had been passed by a tribunal in 1920 than those who were shot without trial in 1937. For 18 months military lawyers studied archive documents: thousands of orders, reports, bulletins, and telegrams. The life and military career of Corps Commander Dumenko were reconstructed, and investigation and trial materials were painstakingly checked out. The conclusion was that there was no evidence of a crime. Neither the corps commander nor his subordinates were guilty. On 27 August 1964 the USSR Supreme Court Military Collegium ordered that the sentence passed on Dumenko and his subordinates "be quashed and the case against them under the code of criminal procedure discontinued for lack of evidence of a crime."

Three years later, my book "The Red General" was published. Forces came to the fore which opposed the truthful depiction of the path travelled by Dumenko and his cavalry. Sad as it is, it is a fact that these forces were the then associates of Marshal S.M. Budennyy. They saw the restoration of Dumenko's good name as an attempt to detract from the fame of their "boss," as a threat to his position as "the one and only" in the history of the red cavalry. All the dirt and slander of 1920 was dredged up again. Using the big name as a cover, they tried in accordance with all the rules of cavalry art to mount an attack against the rehabilitation and against the writer who had chosen "the wrong path." The marshal's signature on letters to people in high places was sufficient to halt the publication of my second book.

It was then my turn to appeal to the general secretary. The party Central Committee put things right. It decided that Dumenko's rehabilitation was not subject to review, and that the personal viewpoint of any individual is not a social stance. In 1975 the publication of my second book was completed. [Passage omitted]

Procurator General Cites Drop in Crime

LD052143 Moscow TASS in English 1943 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 5 TASS—Perestroyka in the Public Prosecutor's Office started yielding results. The effort to combat crime has become more effective and the total number of criminal offences dropped within a year by nine percent. There are achievements in combatting alcoholism. These facts were cited today by USSR Procurator-General Aleksandr Rekunkov. He spoke at an enlarged meeting of the collegium of the USSR Public Prosecutor's Office at which the course of perestroyka in the activity of public prosecutor's bodies has been discussed.

The procurator-general noted that the heightening of legality is manifested also in the drop in the number of warrants for arrests.

At the same time it was noted at the collegium's meeting that the procuratorial supervision is not yet combatting effectively such negative phenomena as negligence on

the transport, embezzlements in the agro-industrial complex and trade, report-padding in construction, violation of the legislation on environmental protection. A lot of work remains to be done to enhance juridical culture in the country.

'Union' Seen as Counterpoint to Ministries

LD052109 Moscow TASS in English 1722 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 5 TASS—"The aim of the founding in the USSR of the Union of Scientific and Technical Societies is to enhance the prestige of the engineering profession, to increase the practical effects of the work done by the engineers," said Academician Aleksandr Ishlinskiy, the chairman of the board of the union. He was addressing the press centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry, commenting on the results of the constituent congress of that new public association, which closed in Moscow Thursday.

One of the association's objectives is to draw highly skilled specialists in resolving the most important tasks involved in the restructuring drive in the Soviet society, in the country's economy. To that end the union is planning to broaden the practices of setting up cost accounting creative collectives joining specialists of various professions for specific research and engineering developments. Moscow already has such a centre signing contracts with mills and factories. Engineers and specialists work there in their time off, and get stipulated reward after completing the orders.

"Under the conditions of deepening the Soviet society's democracy it is advisible to take away from the ministries and departments the 'monopoly to the truth' on issues pertaining to progress in science and technology," Aleksandr Vladislavlev, secretary of the central board of the new union, stressed. Our association is called upon to put forward alternative viewpoints expressing the public opinion. Truth will be born in disputes." We already have such an example: The opinion of scientists and experts in technology became a determining one in a large measure in drawing up the concept of a comprehensive automation of Soviet-machine building. Public control, Professor Vladislavlev stressed, will close the way to voluntaristic actions in the field of scientific-technical policy.

As was pointed out at the press conference, the union is planning to exchange the latest scientific-technical information with kindred organizations abroad. Seminars, creative discussions and competitions with the participation of specialists of various trades are being planned. The funds of the union will be formed chiefly from the voluntary donations by almost 13 million members of the scientific-technical societies incorporated into it.

Lithuanian CP Plenum Hears Restructuring Report

PM081055 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 27 Jan 88 p 1

["Information Report on Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee's 10th Plenum was held 26 January 1988 in Vilnius.

The plenum agenda was as follows:

1. Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau report on work on the leadership of restructuring in the republic.

2. Organizational matters.

On behalf of the Central Committee Bureau R.I. Songayla, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, delivered the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau report on work on the leadership of restructuring in the republic.

The following people contributed to the discussion of the report: R.P. Rimaytis, first secretary of Kaunas Lithuanian Communist Party Gorkom; P.P. Shileykis, hero of socialist labor and team leader at the "Vilnyusstroy" Trust No. 11 Construction Administration; A.I. Chistyakov, second secretary of Vilnius Lithuanian Communist Party Gorkom;. V.S. Astrauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; A.K. Laurinchyukas, editor of the newspaper TIESA; A.M. Ivanov, electrician at the "Metalistas" Metal Products Production Association in Panevezhis; P.A. Mikyalenis, first secretary of Kaunasskiy Lithuanian Communist Party Raykom; V.V. Sakalauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers; I.I. Mikhalkevich, first secretary of Vilnyusskiy Lithuanian Communist Party Raykom; L.K. Shepetis, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee; L.A. Molotok, Lithuanian SSR minister of consumer services; V.P. Azhyalene, garment worker at the Utena Knitwear and Notions Production Association named for M. Melnikayte; V.M. Buchinskene, crop farming team leader at the "Virvichyay" Kolkhoz in Shirvintskiy Rayon; Yu.k. Pozhela, president of the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences; D.A. Obrikene, first secretary of Plungeskiy Lithuanian Communist Party Raykom; L.V. Petravichyus, director of Akmyane's "Akmyantsementas" Cement and Slate Production Association named for the 50th Anniversary of the USSR; V.A. Berezov, chief of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department; P.A. Morkunas, chairman of Shyaulyay Gorispolkom; A.A. Matsaytis, first secretary of the Lithuanian Komsomol Central Committee; P.G. Pilkauskas, director of the "Stanyunay" Experimental Farm in Penevezhskiy Rayon; V.K. Kubilyus, first secretary of Kretingskiy Lithuanian Communist Party Raykom.

A resolution was adopted on the matter under discussion.

The plenum considered some organizational matters.

The plenum relieved Comrade V.S. Astrauskas of the post of Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee secretary upon his election as chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The plenum elected Comrade S.A. Gedraytis Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee secretary and Bureau member.

The plenum relieved Comrade A.A. Ferensas of the post of Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau member upon his retirement on health grounds.

The plenum relieved Comrade A.K. Kayryalis of the post of Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau member upon his retirement.

The plenum elected Comrade L.K. Maksimovas—chairman of the Lithuanian Republic Council of Trade Unions—to membership of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau. He is relieved of the post of chief of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Industry Department.

The plenum elected Comrade Y.V. Lukauskas—chairman of the Lithuanian SSR People's Control Committee—to membership of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau. He is relieved of the post of chairman of the Party Control Commission at the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

The plenum promoted Comrade V.A. Berezov from candidate to full member of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau.

Comrade K.V. Zaletskas—first secretary of Vilnius party gorkom—was elected candidate member of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau.

Comrade Yu.Yu. Kuolyalis was relieved of the post of chief of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Propaganda and Agitation Department upon his appointment as chairman of the Lithuanian SSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting.

The appointment of Comrade Ch.I. Shlizhyus as chief of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Propaganda and Agitation Department was confirmed.

N.N. Leonov and V.S. Galkin, senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in the work of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee plenum.

Vatican Supports Lithuanian 'Extremists'

LD061720 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1554 GMT 6 Feb 88

["Who Is Provoking Anti-Soviet Outbursts in Lithuania"—TASS headline]

[Text] Vilnius, 6 Feb (TASS)—ELTA, the news agency of Lithuania (a Soviet Baltic republic), issued an announcement today, noting in particular a 30 January Vatican Radio broadcast a so-called "appeal to the Lithuanian people and to all people of the world on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of Lithuanian independence." It was broadcast on behalf of a small group of clerical extremists, who are named in the news agency announcement. In the "appeal", ELTA points out: "Hatred for the people of the USSR is incited, and the call is voiced that churches should be used for antisocial excesses."

It is a question of a small group of extremists who, "playing on ideas of national pride, try to speak on behalf of the people and incite gullible people to commit irresponsible acts. They would like to erase the fact that the people of Lithuania chose the path of socialist development as long ago as 1918."

The organs of state power and the mass media receive many letters in which the republic's working people condemn the extremists and those who inspire them and demand that their provocative activities be curtailed, the ELTA announcement says. The letters express satisfaction over the fact that, under glasnost and with the democratization of Soviet society, historical events are being objectively reviewed and cogent, scientific appraisals of them are being given.

ELTA points out that, in the unanimous view of the Lithuanian people, the date of true independence and statehood is 16 December 1918, when Soviet rule was established on the republic's territory.

"The extremists have no support in Soviet Lithuania, and if they ignore the public will by trying to violate public order, restraining measures [mery vozdeystviya] will be applied to them in accordance with Soviet laws," the ELTA announcement stresses.

'Extremist Elements' Disrupt Estonian Meeting

LD051850 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] Tallinn February 5 TASS—The newspaper "Rahva Haal"("Voice of the People") which appears in Soviet Estonia published a report saying that a meeting of the public and scientists was held in the city of Tartu in connection with the 68th anniversary of the signing of the peace treaty between Soviet Russia and the Estonian Republic, which Lenin described as an event of world-wide historic importance. The importance of the treaty for historic destiny of the states that signed it was discussed at the meeting.

The article said that the peace treaty concluded on February 2, 1920 was, on the one hand, the first juridical recognition of the Soviet State. On the other hand, Soviet Russia was the first state to recognize Estonia's independence. The parties to the treaty observed its terms until socialist state replaced bourgeois Estonian state as a result of free elections held in the summer of 1940. The Parliament of Socialist Estonia adopted the decision on Estonia's joining the USSR.

During the meeting, there was a debate on various aspects of the peace treaty which extremist nationalist elements proclaiming themselves "Estonian Group for Making Public the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact" tried to take advantage of. Part of them also tried to provoke disturbances in the streets of the city. In accordance with the decision of the city authorities they were cut short by forces of public order.

"The attempts at the reassessment of the Tartu Peace Treaty from nationalist anti-Soviet positions and provications for which foreign radio stations had been calling several days before the anniversary showed that the extremists from the "Estonian Group for Making Public the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact" fulfill the will of those political circles in the West who are annoyed at the processes taking place in the USSR and the growth of its prestige in international arena, the newspaper writes.

More on Yaroslavl Toxic Spill Accident

Workers Hospitalized

PM051439 Moscow TRUD in Russian 4 Feb 88 p 3

[Report by A. Solenikov, department chief of Yaroslavl Oblast newspaper SEVERNYY RABOCHIY, under the rubric "Reporting the Details": "On That Alarming Night"]

[Excerpts] Yaroslavl—An accident occurred in Yaroslavl on the night of 1 February near the Privolzhye station. [Passage omitted]

At 0600 hours the staff tasked with eliminating the accident and its consequences, led by V. Kovalev, first deputy chairman of Yaroslavl Oblispolkom, decided to evacuate people within a 500-meter zone. Meanwhile the attempts to reduce the leakage of the substance through the tanker's ill-fitting hatch continued. Fire engines and fire-fighting facilities stood by in the event of an explosion. The policemen had only conventional gas masks. Wearing them, you cannot remain in the danger zone for very long. The people in the cordon are replaced, the gas mask boxes are changed—but nonetheless some of the militia workers from the morning cordon shift had to be hospitalized with symptoms of possible poisoning. [Passage omitted]

Everyone who was working in the danger zone was examined by medical workers. That day 12 people were hospitalized for a more thorough investigation of their condition. About 40 people were hospitalized 2 February. Work to neutralize the soil at the scene of the accident continued.

Commission Completes Work

LD071317 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1155 GMT 7 Feb 88

[Text] Yaroslavl, 7 Feb (TASS)—Traffic is back to normal at the Yaroslavl section of the northern railway. Nothing but a snow-free section of freshly dug soil on the permanent way reminds one of the recent accident near a bridge across the Volga.

Today the extraordinary commission of the Yaroslavl Oblispolkom on eliminating the emergency situation ended its work. Its decision is as follows: Thanks to the timely measures taken to render harmless the toxic substance that spilled on the embankment from the damaged tank truck, complete ecological purity of air, adjacent land, and water has been guaranteed. The citizens' health is safe.

The replacement of a part of the permanent railway where the toxic liquid had been spilled became the last strenuous stage of eliminating the emergency. At 1120 yesterday, the railway near the bridge across the Volga began operating as a single track railway.

Operations were carried out on the second track at a precise and intense pace which had been previously calculated to the minute. A 12-meter section of the track was removed by a crane; two grab-bucket cranes began to remove the soil to a depth of up to 3 meters. This was determined by specialists, proceeding from samples taken at different levels of the railway embankments. To save time, special trains moved carefully past the people and machines while they were working. When dusk fell additional lighting came on. And then the last cubic meters of contaminated soil were put on to special platforms. Under the supervision of scientists, the bottom of the hollowed out area was decontaminated, and then the railway embankment rapidly rose again. During that time the track maintenance services changed all the old ties. At 2120 the track was reopened and the first train ran along the renovated track.

The "breathing space" in the traffic was made with such care that it hardly caused any serious holdup in the rail timetable, S. Drugakov, head of the Yaroslavl branch of the northern railway, told a TASS correspondent. All the soil and snow, (approximately 320 cubic meters), removed from the railway embankment has been destroyed far beyond the bounds of the city.

Former Leader G.I. Petrovskiy Commemorated

PM081227 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Life Devoted to the People"]

[Text] The life of G.I. Petrovskiy, a prominent figure in the Communist Party and the Soviet state, was an example of selfless service to the people. A ceremonial session held at the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism in Moscow 3 February was devoted to the 110th anniversary of his birth.

Addressing it, V.P. Kuzmin, the institute's first deputy director, Deputy Director V.V. Zhuravlev, and other speakers described the great and complex path traveled by the Leninist Bolshevik. As chairman of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee, deputy chairman of the USSR Central Executive Committee, and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium—in all the posts to which his party directed him he devoted his entire being to the cause of selflessly serving the people.

G.I. Petrovskiy possessed outstanding personal qualities and exceptional humanity and was constantly among people. He made a weighty contribution to asserting the Leninist style in work and in the selection and placing of cadres. The Leninist Bolshevik carried his Leninist conviction right through his life.

Senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee, party, war, and labor veterans, and representatives of the capital's public participated in the session's work.

OVIR Official on Visa Regulations, Emigration

LD061028 Moscow TASS in English 1009 GMT 6 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 6 TASS—"Our approach to the issue of exit from the Soviet Union is as follows: We permit Soviet citizens to leave the country in keeping with Soviet legislation, provided, of course, there are no weighty grounds for refusal due to being privy to state secrets," a senior Soviet official told a TASS correspondent today.

Some Western publications quoted a pro-Zionist organization in the United States as saying that fewer Soviet citizens were allowed to go to Israel in January this year than last December.

In Vienna, Richard Schifter, U.S. assistant secretary for human rights and humanitarian affairs, alleged in a conversation with a Soviet official that a certain quota on Jewish emigration had been fixed in the USSR.

"It is wrong to raise the question in this way," said Rudolf Kuznetsov, head of the Visa and Registration Office (OVIR) at the Soviet Ministry for the Interior. "Moreover, this represents an attempt to interfere in our country's internal affairs."

"Exit applications are considered in the Soviet Union only when they are submitted by the person in question. And if some people do not ask to leave, we are not going to persuade them to do so to meet the mythical quota.

Besides, it is up to every citizen of our country to decide on the future course of his or her life," the head of OVIR pointed out.

"The following question is legitimate: Are Soviet people eager to settle down abroad as claimed by Zionist circles, for instance, in the United States?

There has emerged a certain trend lately. 334 people who had received the permission to go to Israel in 1987 changed their mind and submitted corresponding applications to Interior Ministry bodies," Kuznetsov said.

"This is five times more than in 1986.

In 1987 alone, 703 people who had earlier left for Israel returned to the USSR.

The process of immigration to the USSR from Western countries has stepped up, too—696 foreigners came to stay in our country in 1987.

For those interested in statistics: 7,862 adults and 2,109 minors left for Israel in 1987—9.4 times more than in 1986."

Psychiatrist Refuses to Talk to Paper

PM081129 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Feb 87 p 1

[Report by S. Leskov: "Discussing 'Prohibited Topic']

[Text] A symposium of the socialist countries' young specialists in forensic psychiatry has been held in Moscow.

The problems of forensic psychiatry, recently accessible only to a restricted circle of professionals, have recently been enjoying heightened interest.

The symposium, in which, in addition to the rising "stars" of psychiatry, leading lights such as G.V. Morozov, member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, R.A. Nadzharov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, and Professors E. Ordaz (Cuba), P. Donchev (Bulgaria), and V. Shumakov (USSR) took part, confirmed that this science is not standing still and that it has many achievements which have very promising prospects.

Special interest was generated by the discussion on the guarantee of the individual's rights in deciding questions of compulsory treatment, on the legal position of patients, and on collaboration between the law and forensic psychiatry in combating crime. The socialist countries resolve these questions in their own way.

Scientists from the all-union scientific research institute of Soviet legislation familiarized the symposium's participants with the recently approved new provision on the conditions and procedure for rendering psychiatric assistance. The 5 January 1988 USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree attests to the great attention paid to this urgent problem. At the same time, it must be noted that the changes which have been adopted attest to the fact that our newspaper's position has received support, although health ministry workers of various ranks have frequently publicly disagreed with it.

Unfortunately, the symposium was not unmarred. A.A. Churkin, chief psychiatrist of the USSR Health Ministry, categorically refused to answer KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA's questions, reproving our newspaper for "listening only to itself." You can draw your own conclusions

Tatars Protest Halt to Crimean Resettlement
AU071618 Paris AFP in English 1601 GMT 7 Feb 88

[Excerpts] Moscow, Feb 7 (AFP)—Some 1,500 Crimean Tatars seeking to return to their Black Sea homeland demonstrated for more than 3 hours in the Uzbek town of Bekabad on Sunday, after local authorities refused to accept a protest addressed to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, a Tatar activist said Sunday.

Tatar representative Server Tuvarchi told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE that about 10 Tatars had signed the open letter to Mr. Gorbachev to complain that "not one" of their demands had been met by a government commission chaired by Soviet President Andrei Gromyko. Mr Tuvarchi was speaking by telephone from Bekabad, 18 kilometres (12 miles) from Tashkent, the capital of the central Asian republic. He said the letter, which was also addressed to the Soviet prosecutor-general, Alexander Rekunkov, called for an end to "repression and persecution" of Tatar militants, and the release of two "political prisoners."

Mr Tuvarchi said the 1,500 Tatars first took their protest to the town hall at noon, where officials refused a meeting. Then they crossed the town to the city's party headquarters, where they were told the offices were closed, he said. He said the demonstration dispersed at about 4 p.m. Police and security forces were present but did not make arrests, he said. Mr Tuvarchi said the Tatars were upset over an unpublished Council of Ministers decision dating from December 24 which he said "temporarily" halted the granting of residence permits in Crimea, on the Black Sea. [passage omitted]

Mr Tuvarchi said that Tatars had learned of the government decision because two people had been evicted from their homes in the Crimea, another had had his property confiscated, and others "don't have the right to go back to their houses which they had bought." He said the Tatars were uncertain whether the government commission, set up during the Moscow protests, had finished its work. [passage omitted]

Mr Tuvarchi said that Tatars planned to continue their protests until they obtained satisfaction. He added that four had been sent to prison for two weeks and four others fined after a local demonstration last month.

Dissident Publishing Using 'High-Tech' Equipment
AU050847 Paris AFP in English 0834 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, Feb 5 (AFP)—A new Soviet dissident review is using Western high-technology equipment to publish material in the Soviet Union at a time when the authorities are reasserting the need for state control over publishing.

Journalist Lev Timofeyev's unofficial journal REFERENDUM, whose first edition came out on December 10, is printed with the help of a Toshiba-1000 computer and iconix printer from Kodak, as a footnote explains at the end of each issue. A far cry from the typewritten samizdat-style still used by other unofficial publications, such as EXPRESS KHRONIKA and VYBOR, which are also refused access to state printing machinery.

Former political prisoner Sergei Grigoriants, who began publishing his trailblazing GLASNOST (openness) unofficial bulletin last July, with its title an unconcealed challenge to the authorities, distributes a phocopied version of his journal. He says he would use computerized methods if he had a better electronic printer. But while such entrepreneurs as Grigoriants and Timofeyev, through their contacts abroad, continue to expand their unofficial publishing activities, in the last few days Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennady Gerasimov has reaffirmed the state's commitment to control of printing and publishing in the Soviet Union.

In remarks to Western journalists, he has stressed that independent cooperative publishing houses would not be allowed, at a time when Soviet publishing is moving into a "self-financing" system along with other branches of industry. The switch to a profit-and-loss basis has affected 60 percent of Soviet industrial output since January 1.

According to some western publishers, "self-financing" in Soviet publishing, involving the notion of supply and demand, is likely to prove a bankrupting experience.

Soviet publishing chief Mikhail Nenashev, who last December told a news conference that cooperative publishing houses would not be set up mainly because of a lack of newsprint, recognises that only 50 percent of

demand for Soviet fiction is being satisfied. The shortage is worse in children's literature, where only 35-40 per cent of demand is met, according to Mr Nenashev. The State Committee for Printing, Publishing and the Book Trade, which he heads, plans to overcome the deficit by the next five-year plan in 1991, and at the same time reduce the number of books—mainly political works—sitting unsold on bookshop shelves.

But analysts said that while the future looked uncertain for some state-run publishers, as they chart a new market-oriented course, the hi-tech future of such journals as Mr Timofeyev's REFERENDUM was also in doubt. For Mr Timofeyev knows that his twice-monthly journal, totalling 80 or 90 copies each issue, can only exist for as long as the authorities agree to tolerate its existence.

Mr Grigoriants told AFP Thursday that in the last month, he and his assistants had, unusually, not been harassed by the authorities as they prepared a new issue of GLASNOST. "They're not against us, but they don't help us," he said. Only 4 months ago, Mr Grigoriants had been threatened with court action, accused of "plundering state property" and violating Soviet printing laws by allegedly using state printing material illegally to publish his journal.

Pozner Comments on New Legislative Amendment

LD071630 Moscow In English to North America 0000 GMT 7 Feb 88

[Text] Watching the process and progress of perestroyka in the Soviet Union is, as far as I am concerned, one of the most mesmerizing experiences imaginable. This may apply to so-called Soviet watchers as well, meaning by that foreign journalists and diplomats based in Moscow and Kremlinologists abroad. But experiencing perestroyka from the inside, being able to assess it from that perspective, provides, it seems to me, a unique perspective. Let me give you just one example.

Earlier this week a major legislative amendment, endorsed by the USSR Supreme Soviet, sent shockwaves through the country, shockwaves of pure delight in most cases, but not all. The amendment applied to so-called anonymous, or unsigned, letters. Allow me to pause for a moment and to explain. Let's imagine a situation where you are being harassed by your boss. You are desperate. You realize of course that to fight him openly, to take the case to his superiors or to the press, or to some public or party body, may be very risky. In fact when your boss learns of this he could make life miserable for you. True, you might win, but the boss has his contacts and they are usually better than the ones you have. In short, to fight back openly is dangerous. So what you can do is to fight back anonymously, by writing a letter to the proper authorities describing all the transgressions and shameful behavior of your boss, but not signing the letter.

So in a way such reports or letters seem to protect the average citizen, they offer a way to fight for their rights without risk of retaliation. But they also offer a limitless opportunity for the worst kind of libel. The anonymous poison pen writer can literally hound a victim, writing an endless stream of letters to which the authorities must react by sending out teams of people to verify the accusation.

But that's only part of the story. People like Stalin or Beriya and many others must have been quick to realize how such anonymous letters could be used as grounds to arrest helpless, innocent citizens, to be branded enemies of the people. And even though the Stalin era is long gone, the practice of checking out anonymous letters, thereby often making life miserable for honest upright citizens whose only crime was to refuse to accept corruption, still remains.

The amendment made public this week outlaws anonymous letters, reports, or complaints. If these are not signed and do not indicate their author's address and place of work they cannot be acted upon in any way. This is a major setback for the poison pen letter writer. It is also a setback for certain elements of the police that have often used such data, and this applies not only to the Soviet Union.

This amendment is yet another aspect of openness. Democracy demands that one stand up and be counted, not like the members of parliament who coined that phrase back in 17th-century England when King Charles could order one's head to be chopped off for opposing the royal view by standing up and being counted nay instead of aye. It means being able to openly state your view without any danger of retaliation, be it from an official source or an anonymous detractor.

Snow Triggers Avalanches in Kirghizia

LD051731 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 5 Feb 88

[Text] Unceasing snowfall has triggered avalanches in the mountain areas of the Soviet Central Asian republic of Kirghizia. Thousands of people have volunteered for rescue operations. People and flocks of sheep have been evacuated from the danger area. In some places the snow cover is over 3 meters deep. Weather forecasters have issued warnings that the avalanches may continue.

Economic

Council of Ministers Reviews Economic Progress

LD221929 Moscow TASS in English 1908 GMT 22 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 22 TASS—A meeting of the USSR Council of Ministers was held today. It discussed the fulfilment of the state plan of the USSR's economic

and social development and state budget in 1987, studied the economic situation in the country and defined the tasks of fulfilling the plan and budget for 1988.

Changes for the better have begun in the economic situation in the country, it was noted at the meeting. In the first two years of the current five-year plan the increment of industrial output, as it was provided for by the plan, amounted to 8.9 per cent. The development of agriculture is aquiring a stable nature. The annual gross grain harvest exceeded 210 million tons, this being 17 per cent more than in the years of the 11th Five-Year-Plan period. The average annual volume of meat production went up by 13 per cent and of milk by 8.7 per cent. All branches of the national economy exceeded the plan assignments to increase labour productivity. The share of capital investment in the retooling and reconstruction of operating enterprises went up to 46 per cent as against 39 per cent in 1985.

As compared with 1985 the construction of housing increased in 1987 by 15 per cent, of childcare centres by 16 per cent, hospitals by 17 per cent, general educational schools by 27 per cent and outpatient clinics by 34 per cent. The average monthly earnings of industrial and office workers during the two years went up by 5.9 per cent and the remuneration of the work of collective farmers by 8.9 per cent. The population's real incomes have grown.

As compared with 1985 the gross national product went up by 8 per cent. In 1987 the rates of increment of industrial output were 3.8 per cent, this being in accordance with the plan assignment.

But no substantial advance has been yet attained along a whole number of directions of socio-economic development. The assignment for increasing produced national income was not fulfilled. During the past two years it increased by 6.5 per cent whereas the figure set by the plan was 8.2 per cent. The shortfall of 13 billion roubles in fullfilling the 1987 plan assignment to increase national income limited possibilities to accelerate industrial and social development in the country. The situation in the field of finance remains strained mostly because of the existence of a large number of enterprises operating at a loss, and the still considerable nonproductive expenditures and losses in the national economy.

The USSR Government particularly pointed out that the positive changes in the economy have not yet become stable.

The Council of Ministers of the USSR outlined concrete directions of improving the work of the key elements of the machine-building, chemical-timber, construction and agro-industrial complexes, and the various types of transport. It also outlined measures to enhance reliability of work in the power, oil, gas and coal industries.

The members of the Soviet Government devoted much attention to questions of implementing the social policy formulated by the 27th CPSU Congress.

Currency Stores Called 'Hotbed of Machinations'

LD291146 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 28 Jan 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; V. Bakarinov video report]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] The USSR Council of Ministers has adopted a decision on measures aimed at eliminating negative phenomena in trading goods for Vneshposyltorg [administration for export of goods to Soviet citizens abroad] vouchers.

[Bakarinov] People have been talking for a long time. No sooner would someone start a rumor from time to time quoting reliable sources than a panic would erupt. Regular storms of passions in front of Berezka stores [hard currency stores] are still going strong and not over yet. Tens of thousands of people who get their pay in ordinary rubles are surprised, to put it mildly, to see enormous lines near these prestigious shops. I do not even know whether I was right to use the word prestigious, whether I should put it in inverted commas, or use it in its direct meaning. People have an ambivalent attitude toward those standing in lines. On the one hand they are joined by many people who have honestly earned Vneshposyltorg vouchers abroad, but on the other hand....

[V.S. Gorokhov, head of 47th Moscow Militia Department, identified from screen caption] We think Berezka shops are a hotbed for machinations, speculation, and other criminal offenses.

[Bakarinov] What about the customers who have been standing in line near the Berezka shops since the early hours of the morning? What do they say?

[First woman] Eighty percent of those who are standing in this line are not entitled to this money. They are not the ones who have earned it.

[Second woman] I have personally seen with my own eyes a man writing a check and then immediately selling it to someone else. [passage omitted]

Agricultural

Media Report 1-6 Feb Agricultural Developments

LD070135 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 1-6 February. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

1-2 February

No fileworthy items monitored.

3 February

Some two-thirds of Ukrainian farms involved in growing sugar beets repeatedly fail to reach their yearly targets. To overcome the lag, the so-called Ukrainian intensive technology for the production of sugar beets will be implemented in the republic. The technology envisages the use of the best available seeds, a progressive processing sytem, an increase in the application of fertilizers, and optimal time-limits for completing all kinds of work. That gives an average increase of 100 quintals per hectare. (1400)

4 February

Preparations for spring field work are being carried out at a very slow pace in the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Amur Oblast, as our correspondent reports. Serious backlogs in preparing the seed stock and repairing the machinery have been permitted here. The training and the retraining of cadres [passage indistinct] is being immplemented slowly. Having analyzed the situation that has developed, the Amur Party Obkom bureau requested that the party rayon and primary organizations ensure the restructuring of the management of agricultural production and adopt urgent measures on accelerating the progress of preparation of agro-industrial complex for spring. (0230)

Tajik farmers are top-dressing the more than 180,000 hectares sown to winter cereal in the republic. Good shoots have appeared almost everywhere, though low precipation has slowed their growth. (0300)

5 February

No fileworthy items monitored.

6 February

Tajikistan's farms will be preparing around 29,000 metric tons of cotton seed for sowing in the forthcoming season. Now that many of the farms are operating under financial autonomy, seed quality is of particular importance, and this year 75-80 percent is to be of first class category. This is 1 and 1/2 times more than last year. Unfortunately, all the machinery used for preparing the seed is either adapted for these purposes or else created at the processing enterprises themselves, which means that little can be said for its efficiency. This problem is growing from year to year; the country's machine-builders must find a way to solve it.